HARVARD THEOLOGICAL REVIEW
VOLUME LIII OCTOBER, 1960 NUMBER 4

SUR LE CULTE D'ANGELOS DANS LE PAGANISME GREC ET ROMAIN

F. SOKOLOWSKI
GOUVIEUX, FRANCE

LE problème des anges dans le paganisme ancien et dans le christianisme a été discuté plusieurs fois déjà par les théologiens et les historiens sans accord sur la question fondamentale, quels éléments dans ce culte sont païens et quels sont juifs et chrétiens. Ainsi Dibelius,[1] Bousset[2] et Andres[3] ont vu dans les documents relatifs à ce sujet les idées et les formules grecques, le rapport des anges avec le monde souterrain surtout leur parut particulièrement grec. Selon Cumont le culte des anges était un apport oriental dans le monde grec et romain.[4] Dans ses derniers travaux Cumont examine les similitudes entre les croyances eschatologiques païennes et chrétiennes et conclut qu'elles proviennent d'une source commune, notamment du mazdeisme. Les chercheurs modernes ne sont pas d'accord sur la signification du terme *angelos* qui se rencontre dans les épitaphes de Théra. Selon M. Guarducci[5] les inscriptions sont païennes, selon H. Gregoire,[6] A. Ferrua[7] et L. Robert[8] elles sont chrétiennes. M. P. Nilsson ne se prononce pas sur le fond du problème, mais il remarque que la question reste ouverte, si à côté de l'ange juif et chrétien il y avait dans les croyances anciennes un ange païen.[9]

[1] Die Geisterwelt im Glauben des Paulus, Göttingen, 1907, pp. 209–221.
[2] ARW, XVIII, 1915, pp. 170–171.
[3] RE, III, Suppl. pp. 102–111.
[4] Comptes rend. Ac. Inscr., 1906, p. 73. Rev. Hist. Rel., XXXVI, 1915, pp. 159–180. Pisciculi Dölger, Münster, 1939, pp. 70–75. Lux Perpetua, Paris, 1949, pp. 230–231.
[5] Studi e mater. stor. rel., XV, 1939, pp. 79–88.
[6] Recueil Inscr. Gr. Chr., I, pp. 56 sqq., n°s 166–206. Byz. Zeitschr., 1929/30, pp. 641–644.
[7] Orientalia Christ. Period., XIII, 1947, pp. 149–158.
[8] Bull. épigr. (in REG), 1941, p. 254 n° 106. Rev. de l'Inst. d'Arch. de l'Univ. d'Ankara, III, 1958, p. 122, n. 71.
[9] Gesch. gr. Rel., II, p. 518, n.3 :"Es ist noch eine offene Frage, ob es neben dem judisch-christlichen auch heidnische Engel gab, besonders ob die Grabsteine auf Thera mit der Formel ἄγγελος τοῦ δεῖνα heidnisch oder christlich sind."

Les documents relatifs aux anges sont aujourd'hui plus riches grâce aux investigations en Asie Mineure et je crois qu'il sera utile de les examiner dans l'espoir qu'un peu de lumière sera faite sur ces problèmes compliqués.

Citons d'abord les dédicaces provenant de la région Stratonicée-Lagina et une inscription trouvée en Lydie de l'époque impériale tardive:

1. Διὶ Ὑψίστῳ καὶ Θείῳ Ἀγγέλῳ Νέ(ω)ν καὶ Εὐφροσύνη ὑπὲρ τῶν ἰδίων.[10]
2. Θείῳ Ἀγγελικῷ εὐχαριστοῦμεν ὑπὲρ σωτηρίας.[11]
3. Θείῳ Ἀγγελικῷ εὐχαριστοῦμεν.[12]
4. Διὶ Ὑψίστῳ καὶ Ἀγαθῷ Ἀγγέλῳ Κλαύδιος Ἀχιλλεὺς καὶ Γαλατία ὑπὲρ σωτηρίας μετὰ τῶν ἰδίων πάντων χαριστήριον.[13]
5. ..... ιων καὶ Λουκία ..... καὶ Ἀνγέλῳ Ὁσίῳ Δικαίῳ εὐχαριστοῦντες ἀνέστησαν διὰ προφήτου Ἀλεξάνδρου Σαϊττηνοῦ.[14]

La divinité à laquelle on a offert ces inscriptions est appelée Theion Angelos, Theion Angelicon, Agathos Angelos et Angelos Hosios-Dikaios. Sur deux dédicaces la divinité en question est couplée avec Zeus Hypsistos. L'association de ces deux divinités ne prouve pas nécessairement que les offrandes proviennent d'un fidèle juif ou oriental. Selon l'opinion raisonable de A. D. Nock l'appellation Hypsistos était assez vague et pouvait être attribuée sans scrupule aux dieux païens et orientaux.[15] Je crois que les dédicaces trouvées dans les environs de Stratonicée-Lagina étaient offertes aux grandes divinités de la région, notamment à Zeus et à Hécatè.[16] M. Guarducci [17] et A. Laumonier [18] ont suggéré déjà cette identification, mais ils n'ont pas voulu insister sur sa probabilité. Pourtant la dénomination *Angelos* ajoutée à Hécatè-Artémis était assez courante dans le monde grec.

[10] Bull. Corr. Hell., 1881, p. 182, n° 3.
[11] Bull. Corr. Hell., 1934, p. 337.
[12] Rev. Arch. 1935, II, p. 155.
[13] Le Bas-Waddington, Inscr. Gr. Lat., III, 515.
[14] Rev. de l'Inst. d'Arch. de l'Univ. d'Ankara, III, 1958, p. 120.
[15] HTR, XXIX, 1936, pp. 63–64.
[16] Cf. Bull. Corr. Hell., 1934, p. 337, n° 20.
[17] Op. cit., p. 85.
[18] Bull. Corr. Hell., 1934, pp. 338–339. Les cultes indigènes en Carie, Paris, 1958, p. 391, n. 2 et pp. 418–419.

Le caractère d'Hécatè a été bien expliqué par Wilamowitz,[19] Kern [20] et M. P. Nilsson.[21] A l'origine c'était une divinité protectrice des maisons et des habitants contre un mal du dehors. Hécatè à l'époque ancienne déjà était identifiée avec Artémis qui pour cette raison porte les épithètes *Hecataia* et *Enodia*.[22] L'épithète *Hêgemône* était portée par Artémis et par Hécatè sans distinction.[23] Dans une dédicace de la Crimée un mercenaire spartiate exprime l'offrande qu'il fait par la formule: Ἑκάτηι Σπάρτης μεδεούσηι.[24] L'expression insolite devient tout à fait compréhensible, si l'on se rappelle qu'il s'agit en réalité d'Artémis de Sparte. Selon le témoignage d'Hésychius, Artémis portait à Syracuse l'épithète *Angelos*. La même appellation était attribuée à la déesse à Samos et à Didyme. Dans l'inventaire d'Héra de Samos on trouve la mention des κρήδεμνα et des κιθῶνες portés par ἡ Εὐαγγελίς.[25] Certains érudits prennent ce dernier mot pour le nom officiel de la prêtresse,[26] d'autres y voient, avec plus de probabilité, une épithète d'Artémis dont le culte est attesté à Samos.[27] Dans les comptes des trésoriers du sanctuaire de Didyme de l'époque impériale nous trouvons la mention suivante: ils ont construit τὸν περίβολον τῆς Ἀγγέλου.[28] Rehm dans le commentaire sur ce passage apporte plusieurs témoignages selon lesquels le nom *Angelos* était donné à Artémis-Hécatè. Les scholia à Théocrite citent le mimographe Sophron qui dans un écrit entitulé Angelos a tracé la curieuse histoire de la fille de Zeus et d'Héra. Les péripéties du comportement de la jeune Angelos (tel était son nom) reflètent le caractère d'Hécatè elle-même et la scholiaste ajoute l'explication suivante: τὴν Ἑκάτην

[19] Der Glaube der Hellenen, I, pp. 169–177.
[20] Die Rel. der Griechen, I, p. 245 sqq.
[21] Gesch. gr. Rel., I², pp. 722–725.
[22] Cf. Aisch., Hik. 676. Eur., Phoen. 109.
[23] Cf. Th. Hopfner, Pisciculi Dölger, pp. 138–140. Ziehen, RE², III, p. 1462.
[24] Inscr. o. s. Pont. Eux., II, 23.
[25] Michel, Recueil Inscr. Gr. 832, 21–22 et 37.
[26] Köhler, Ath. Mitt., 1882, p. 370, n. 2. Dieterich, Zeitschr. neut. Wiss., 1900, p. 337.
[27] E. Maas, Indog. Forsch. 1892, pp. 162–164. Cf. Usener, Götternamen, pp. 268–269.
[28] Didyma II, Inschriften, n° 405, 9–11 et p. 243.

χθονίαν φασὶ θεὸν καὶ νερτέρων πρύτανιν· ὄνομα δ'αὐτῇ θέσθαι ἄγγελον.[29]

Ces témoignages s'accordent bien avec ce que nous avons dit au sujet de l'identification d'Angelos avec Hécatè sur les dédicaces de Stratonicée. Déjà dans l'hymne homérique cette déesse est appelée *πρόπολος* et *ὀπάων* de Déméter.[30] Le rôle du *messager* s'explique bien par le caractère de la divinité qui servait de médiateur entre les deux mondes. Comme esprit de vengeance et de la justice, Hécatè a pu être appelé *angelos* des dieux de l'enfer. Ainsi Platon appelle Némesis dont les traits sont très proches d'Hécatè, *angelos* de la Dikè.[31] Les écrits orphiques mentionnent souvent les *angeloi* de vengeance qui punissent les pécheurs dans l'autre monde.[32] Une lumière sur ce caractère d'Hécatè nous est fourni par une anecdote de la vie du philosophe Menippus de Gadara. On raconte qu'il se faisait passer pour une Érinys qui l'enquêtait sur les méfaits et les crimes pour rapporter aux démons de l'enfer le résultat de l'investigation.[33]

Le nom *angelos* est souvent donné à Hermès. Les tragiques le représentent comme messager qui portait les prières et le communications d'un monde à l'autre.[34] Dans un épitaphe de Néapolis il est appelé *angelos* de Perséphonè.[35] Nous lisons dans un autre épitaphe que Pluton, Korè, Hermès et Hécatè ont transferé le mort dans un autre monde.[36] Les inscriptions imprécatoires mentionnent souvent les *ἄγγελοι καταχθόνιοι*, mais nous sommes informés par certains textes que ce nom se rapporte à Hermès et à Hécatè: *καταγράφω καὶ κατατίθω ἀνγέλοις καταχθονίοις*, *Ἑρμῇ καταχθονίῳ καὶ Ἑκάτῃ καταχθονίᾳ*, *Πλούτωνι καὶ Κόρῃ καὶ Περσεφώνῃ καὶ Μοίραις*.[37] Il semble donc que dans la religion populaire Hermès et Hécatè aient été représentés commes *messagers* des dieux de l'enfer.

[29] Schol. Théocrite, II, 12.
[30] In Dem. 440–41.
[31] Leg. 717 a. Cf. Bull. Corr. Hel., 1914/15, p. 89.
[32] Cf. Dieterich, Nekyia, Leipzig, 1898, p. 4, ll. 21 et 23. Quandt, Orph. hymni, III, 9.
[33] Diog. Laert., VI, 102.
[34] Aisch., Choeph., 123–126. Soph., Oed. C. 1549. Aiax 832.
[35] W. Peek, Griech. Vers-inschr., I, 1883.
[36] Ibid., n° 1916.
[37] Audollent, Def. tab., p. 102, n^{os} 74–75. Cf. Ziebarth, Sitzb. P. A., 1934, p. 1047, n° 27.

Le nom *angelos* se voit sur les épitaphes de Théra. Si Hermès et Hécatè portaient ce nom dans certains endroits, il n'est pas impossible qu'ils soient appelés *angeloi* à Théra. Sur plusieurs stèles funéraires de Thessalie on voit l'inscription Ἑρμάου Χθονίου. Cette formule signifie que le tombeau était mis sous la protection du dieu des morts.[38] Hécatè est invoquée dans un épigramme pour protéger l'inviolabilité du tombeau.[39] Il se peut que certaines raisons suggèrent le caractère chrétien des épitaphes de Théra, mais la formule *angelos* elle-même ne peut constituer un argument en faveur de cette hypothèse.

Le mot *angelos* a été pris du grec par les traducteurs de l'Ancien Testament. Dans certains passages il traduit l'expression hébraique *mal'akh Iahve*, dans d'autres, il correspond à l'hébreu *bene El* ou *Elohim*. La première traduction, selon l'opinion des spécialistes, est une métaphore qui signifie la théophanie ou la manifestation du dieu.[40] Ainsi peut se comprendre la dédicace latine d'Ostie: Iovi O. M. Angelo Heliopolitano.[41] Le sens de la seconde expression est moins clair. Parmi les spéculations juives sur les anges il y en a une très intéressante, notamment que les anges sont des dieux des pays et des peuples païens. Les anges apparaissent de plus en plus dans la théologie juive à la suite du contact avec le monde païen pendant et après l'exil. Le même fait a pu se produire par le contact avec le monde grec. Le mot *angelos* était emprunté au grec et adapté aux idées religieuses juives. Mais dans plusieurs cas la formule est tellement équivoque que nous ne pouvons pas dire, s'il s'agit d'un document païen, chrétien ou juif.

[38] IG, IX, 2, Index.
[39] Wünsch, Def. tab., p. VI. Cf. Audollent, op. cit., n° 99,9.
[40] Cf. Kittel, Theol. Wörtb., I, pp. 77 et 85.
[41] CIL, XIV, 24.

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025

https://archive.org/details/harvard-theological-review_1960-10_53_4

"THOMAS" AND THE GROWTH OF THE GOSPELS *

R. McL. WILSON

St. Mary's College, St. Andrews, Scotland

The title of this paper quite evidently promises more than can be fulfilled in the space of a single lecture. On any reckoning, the Gospel of Thomas contains over 100 *logia*,[1] and even if some may for present purposes be set aside the discussion and evaluation of the rest would still be enough to fill a quite substantial book. All that is offered here is a preliminary survey, an attempt to indicate some of the possible lines of approach, some of the conclusions which may be drawn, to present a few examples, chosen among many, which may serve to show the similarities and the variations between Thomas and our Gospels, and thereby to illustrate the ways in which the new document may very well enrich our understanding of the development of the Gospel tradition.

The text as it now stands is comparatively late, at least from the point of view of the student of the early Gospel tradition. Estimates of the date of the Coptic Ms vary, according to Dr. Till, between the third century A.D. and about 500, his own guess being about 400.[2] Such collections, however, as Professor Henry Chadwick has recently observed,[3] tend to take on the character of a snowball; they grow with the passing of time. This means in the present context that the date of the Coptic document offers no criterion by which to judge the value of its contents, that even if some passages bear the demonstrable marks of a later age their

* A paper read at the Third International Congress on Patristic Studies, Oxford, in September, 1959. The "official" edition of the Gospel of Thomas, containing the Coptic text with translation, has since been published.

[1] The official reckoning, followed by Puech (in Hennecke-Schneemelcher, NT Apokryphen, i (Tübingen, 1959), 199 ff.) and Till (BJRL, 41 (1959), 446 ff.), counts one hundred and fourteen *logia*, Leipoldt (TLZ, 1958, 481 ff.) one hundred and twelve, Doresse (L'Évangile de Thomas, ou Les Paroles de Jésus (Paris, 1959), one hundred and eighteen. For convenience of reference, the passages quoted in this paper are cited by plate and line of the photographic edition (Labib, Coptic Gnostic Papyri in the Coptic Museum at Old Cairo (Cairo, 1956), vol. i).

[2] Op. cit., 451.

[3] The Sentences of Sextus (Cambridge, 1959), 159.

presence is not in any way decisive for the dating of the rest. The vital question is not so much the date of our present Gospel of Thomas, or of its immediate Greek original, but that of the nucleus from which the whole collection grew. In point of fact we have three Greek *logia* fragments of the third century, found at Oxyrhynchus, all of which are embodied, more or less complete, in the new text.[4] There are certain differences, for which an explanation must be sought, but these fragments seem to justify us at least to the extent of thinking of an earlier Greek original. Moreover one at least of these fragments, as the scribal errors show, was copied from an older manuscript,[5] which may take us back still further. Finally, Professor H. C. Puech has observed that a Gospel of Thomas is actually mentioned by Hippolytus and by Origen, and that the former seems to quote our document.[6] The original nucleus may accordingly be dated with some confidence in the second century.

At the other end of the scale, there are certain sayings in Thomas which are quoted by Clement of Alexandria as occurring in the Gospel according to the Hebrews or the Gospel according to the Egyptians.[7] It seems to have been commonly assumed that Thomas derived these sayings from these other Gospels, which would of course mean that the new Gospel must be later; but this is not the only possibility. It is quite conceivable that Thomas was the source for the other two, or at least that both they and Thomas go back to the same tradition.[8] At any rate the Gospel according to the Hebrews would appear to have been more or less a complete Gospel, so much so indeed that if we may trust Jerome it was by some considered the Hebrew original of Matthew.[9] If Thomas is the later, we should have to explain why the author acted as he did, selecting only sayings and abandoning the rest.

Much the same, of course, may be said of the relation between

[4] The identification was made in 1952 by Puech. Cf. Hennecke-Schneemelcher, 61 ff. (Schneemelcher and Jeremias), 212 ff. (Puech).

[5] Schneemelcher, loc. cit.

[6] Op. cit., 199 f.

[7] Cf. Puech, op. cit., 214 ff.

[8] Cf. Schneemelcher, loc. cit.

[9] On this point see the discussion by Vielhauer, in Hennecke-Schneemelcher, 75 ff.

Thomas and the canonical Gospels. When a collection of sayings is found to contain many close parallels to our four Gospels, the natural inference is that these sayings were derived from the New Testament books; but due account must be taken of the differences. As Leipoldt has observed,[10] if Thomas used our Gospels we ought to be able to discern a deliberate purpose in the variations, but in many cases this is quite impossible. On the contrary, it is sometimes the saying in Thomas which seems to be the more primitive. If some *logia* are manifestly expansions of familiar synoptic sayings, others present a shorter form; some appear in groupings differing from those of the canonical Gospels, and over the document as a whole the order of the sayings is quite different. If Thomas used our Gospels, why did he make the changes? Why did he distort the order? Why did he separate sayings which in the canonical Gospels appear together, and that even when he reproduces them with the greatest accuracy? The conclusion, reached independently by Leipoldt, Puech and Quispel,[11] is surely well established, that behind this document lies an early tradition independent of the Synoptics. At least there is justification for adopting this view as a working hypothesis until reason is shown to the contrary. Leipoldt adds that this tradition must go back before the canonization of the Gospels, which would confirm the second-century date already suggested. Puech would place the last redaction about A.D. 140 or a little later.[12]

Not all the sayings, of course, are so early as this, but for present purposes the later elements may be set aside. The passages with which we are primarily concerned are those which have parallels more or less close in the canonical Gospels, or elsewhere in the New Testament. It should, however, be noted that even if a passage is manifestly secondary in comparison with the canonical tradition it may be nonetheless significant, as indicating

[10] Op. cit., 494.

[11] Leipoldt, TLZ, 1958, 494 f., Puech, CR Acad. Inscrr. et Belles-Lettres, 1957, 146 ff. and in Hennecke-Schneemelcher, 221 f., Quispel, Vig. Chr. xi (1957), 189 ff., NTS, 5 (1959), 277.

[12] Op. cit., 221: "Höchstens wird man geneigt sein, die letzte Redaktion unseres Evangeliums um 140 oder vielleicht sogar ein wenig später anzusetzen." But "wir haben in der Tat den Beweis, dass es verschiedene Bearbeitungen unseres Werkes gegeben hat, und dürfen die, welche wir dank des Papyrus von Nag Hamâdi jetzt besitzen, weder für die erste noch für die endgültige halten."

the motives at work in the further development of the tradition, the ideas current among the people by whom, or among whom, it was handed down; and this would remain true even if Thomas were dependent on our Gospels. What we have in the sayings with which we are now concerned is not the legendary embellishment, the pure fancy, characteristic of so many apocryphal gospels, but variant forms of recognizable canonical sayings. At the same time we must beware lest apparent similarity lead us to wrong conclusions. To take but one example, the familiar parable of the hidden treasure appears in an unfamiliar form:

> The kingdom is like a man who had in his field a hidden treasure about which he did not know. When he died, he left it to his son. His son also did not know. He took possession of the field, and sold it. The man who bought it came to plough, and found the treasure, and began to lend at interest to whomsoever he chose.[13] (Cf. Matthew 13.44.)

The manuscript is damaged, so that some of the details are not certain, but the general sense is clear. In view of the strictures passed upon usury by the Church of a later age it is perhaps not without significance that at one time and in certain circles to lend at interest was apparently regarded as a laudable enterprise. But it is completely alien to the canonical tradition of the teaching of Jesus, and indeed conflicts with another saying in Thomas.[14]

The interest of this passage lies in the expansion which has taken place — if Thomas is indeed using Matthew. Closer examination, however, reveals that the one common element is the theme of the hidden treasure; all else is different. In the synoptic parable the only real question, as Dodd puts it,[15] is whether the *tertium comparationis* is the immense value of the thing found, or the sacrifice by which it is acquired; but of this there is nothing

[13] Labib, 98. 31–99. 3. German translation of the whole Gospel by Leipoldt, TLZ, 1958, French in Doresse. An English translation, for a copy of which I am indebted to Professor B. M. Metzger, has been prepared by the New Testament Seminar of Princeton Theological Seminary. Some portions are translated into German in Hennecke-Schneemelcher, or into English in Till. The following quotations are made from the Coptic, after consultation of the translations mentioned.

[14] Cf. Matt. 5. 42, Luke 6. 34 f. Also Labib, 96. 35–97.1: "If you have money, do not lend it for interest. . . ."

[15] The Parables of the Kingdom (London, 1941), 112.

in Thomas. Cerfaux [16] and Doresse [17] find a closer parallel in a rabbinic story, significantly of the second century A.D., and Cerfaux adds that Thomas here combines two themes, that of the hidden treasure and one derived from Aesop's fables, in which a man leaves land to his sons, and it is the one who sets to work who finds the treasure. The clue lies in the association, pointed out by Cerfaux,[18] between the kingdom and *gnosis*, the knowledge of his true origin and destiny which is latent in every man, but which only the Gnostic can truly be said to possess, and in which he finds the knowledge of the Father. If Thomas did use Matthew's parable, he has adapted it to a Gnostic purpose.

That the point of the synoptic parable was not one to which Thomas took exception is shown by three other parables, all of which have the same general structure. The first is Synoptic:

> The kingdom of the Father is like a merchant who had a shipment of goods, and found a pearl. That merchant was wise. He sold the shipment of goods, and bought for himself the pearl alone.[19] (Cf. Matthew 13.45 f.)

This is sufficiently close to the parable of the Pearl of Great Price to be recognized as simply another version. The only question is which is the more primitive, and here the stress on the merchant's wisdom is surely secondary, while the phrase "the kingdom of the Father" has a Gnostic ring. More significant perhaps is the fact that in Matthew this parable immediately follows that of the Hidden Treasure, while in Thomas they are separated by some four pages, and the Pearl comes first in order. Moreover Thomas adds a version of a saying from the Sermon on the Mount:

> You also, seek after his treasure which does not perish, but abideth, where moth does not enter to devour nor does worm destroy.[20] (Cf. Matthew 6.19–20.)

[16] Le Muséon, 70 (1957), 314 f.
[17] Op. cit. 202.
[18] Op. cit., 316 ff.
[19] Labib, 94. 13–22. Cf. Cerfaux, op. cit., 312 f. I owe the phrase "shipment of goods" to the Princeton translation. The Coptic has the Greek word φορτίον, and Cerfaux thinks of a pedlar with his pack. The Greek word could mean either. Jeremias (The Parables of Jesus (ET, London, 1954), 139) thinks in the Synoptic parable of a merchant in a large way of business.
[20] Cerfaux (op. cit., 313) finds links also with Matt. 6. 33 and John 6. 27.

In Matthew these two parables are followed by that of the Drag-net, with which we may compare a parable from another part of Thomas:

> Man is like a wise fisherman who cast his net into the sea, and drew it up from the sea full of small fish. Among them the wise fisherman found a large good fish. He threw down all the small fish into the sea; he chose the large fish without trouble.[21]

If Matthew's parable is the basis here, it has been adapted to the type of the parables of the Kingdom, save that in Thomas it is not a parable of the kingdom. It is not of course impossible that Jesus told such a story, but if he did it has suffered modification in the course of the tradition. Certainly the repetition of "wise" would seem to be secondary, and the whole looks like an adaptation. Here Thomas adds the familiar "He that hath ears to hear, let him hear," which occurs six times in this Gospel, four times in agreement with Matthew's version, twice in agreement with Mark and Luke.[22]

The third parable to be considered in this connection is a variant of the story of the Lost Sheep:

> The kingdom is like a shepherd who had a hundred sheep. One of them, the biggest, went astray. He left the ninety-nine others, and sought after the one till he found it. When he had laboured, he said to the sheep, "I love thee more than the ninety-nine."[23] (Cf. Matthew 18. 12 f., Luke 15. 4–6.)

As Cerfaux has observed, this is not a parable of the Kingdom either in Matthew or in Luke. Moreover, although the parable as a whole is fairly close to the synoptic versions it differs from them in one detail, which may be significant: the sheep was the biggest. It is this that prompts the inclusion of the story in this group, since it suggests that the kingdom here is to be identified *with the sheep*, that a parable which in the Synoptics proclaims

---

Matthew's βρῶσις, which seems to be the catchword here, is replaced in Thomas by "worm," which occurs in the NT only in Mark 9.48. Quispel (Vig. Chr., XIII (1959), 93) notes here a parallel to Tatian's Diatessaron.

[21] Labib, 81. 28–82.2; cf. Quispel (NTS, 5 (1959), 289 f.).

[22] Assuming that the Nestlé text is right in omitting ἀκούειν in Matt. 11.15, 13.9 and 43.

[23] Labib, 98. 22–27. Cf. Cerfaux, op. cit., 314, 322 ff.

the love of God and the joy there is in heaven over one sinner who repents has been adapted to present *gnosis* as the supreme goal of man's endeavor. The parable was apparently a favorite among the Gnostics, and its adaptation in Thomas serves to show the use which could be made of it, and to add further justification to the complaint of Irenaeus that they distorted the Scripture for their own ends.[24]

Reference has already been made to the six-fold occurrence in Thomas of the familiar formula "He that hath ears to hear. . . ." An examination of the contexts in which it occurs provides further evidence of the variations of order. On its first appearance it immediately precedes the parable of the Sower, which in the Synoptics it follows.[25] In the second case it follows a saying which recalls the end of the parable of the Seed growing secretly:

> May there be among you a man of understanding! When the fruit was ripe, he came quickly, his sickle in his hand, and reaped it.[26] (Cf. Mark 4. 29.)

But in Thomas this follows a complex which begins:

> If the householder knows that the thief is coming, he will watch . . . . (Cf. Matthew 24. 43–44 and par.)

The parable of the Mustard Seed, which in Mark follows, appears in Thomas on the previous page.

In the third case, the formula introduces the reply of Jesus to a question posed by the disciples, both uncanonical although they have links with canonical sayings.[27] The fourth follows a parable epigrammatic in its brevity:

[24] Cerfaux refers for Gnostic use of the parable to Irenaeus and to the Gospel of Truth. In an earlier work he claims that the motif of the Lost Sheep in the system of Simon Magus is drawn not from the Gospel but from paganism (Recueil Cerfaux (Gembloux, 1954) i. 240 ff.). For the complaint of Irenaeus see Adv. Haer. i. 1.14H. et al. Other interpretations than that suggested in the text are of course not excluded. It was part of the menace of Gnosticism that it could appear "harmless as a dove," and the simple Christian read without misgiving a parable which for the Gnostic conveyed an esoteric meaning.

[25] Labib, 82. 2–3. This follows the parable of the fisherman, so that (if this parable is based on the Drag-net) we should here have Matt. 13. 47–50, 13.9 (or 43) and 13. 1–9, in that order.

[26] Labib, 85. 16–19. Doresse treats this as a separate saying, and refers to Matt. 13. 37–43, 3.12 and par., John 4. 36–38, but none of these appears so close as the Marcan text.

[27] Cf. Doresse 162 f.

> There was a rich man who had many possessions. He said, I will use my possessions to sow and reap and plant, and fill my barns with fruits, that I may have need of nothing. These were his thoughts in his heart. And in that night he died.[28] (Cf. Luke 12. 16 ff.)

This is clearly a shorter version of the parable of the Rich Fool, but what is more interesting is that in some manuscripts of Luke also the formula is added.[29] Have we here the influence of an apocryphal tradition upon the manuscripts, or did the formula belong here in Luke or in his source? Again, this shorter version of the parable must raise the question of Lucan editing in the Synoptic form.

Of the three occurrences of the formula in Matthew two appear in the thirteenth chapter, one after the parable of the Sower, the other after the interpretation of the parable of the Tares. One occurrence in Thomas, in association with the parable of the Sower, has already been mentioned, and it is not without interest that the sixth also follows a saying parallel to this chapter:

> The kingdom of the Father is like a woman who took a little leaven and hid it in meal; she made large loaves of it.[30] (Cf. Matthew 13. 33.)

In Matthew this parable is separated from the formula by an exposition of the purpose of parables and the interpretation of the parable of the Tares, which if the association of parable and formula is original would be Matthaean insertions; but the parable of the Tares and that of the Mustard Seed, which in Matthew immediately precede that of the Leaven, occur in Thomas separate from one another and several pages earlier.[31] Does Thomas perhaps give us a glimpse of the materials upon which the evangelists had to work?

This question is prompted also by the remaining case, in which the formula falls between two passages of Mark. The first is:

[28] Labib, 92. 2–10. Creed on Luke 12. 17–19 compares 16.3 and 20.13 "where a similar ejaculation . . . is introduced by Lk. into the Marcan version." Is the deliberative question, missing from Thomas, a mark of Lucan style?

[29] HU al. The formula is added also in some Mss. at Mark 7.16 and Luke 21.4. Of the six occurrences in Thomas the first two add ἀκούειν, the rest omit.

[30] Labib, 97. 2–6.

[31] Tares: Labib, 90. 32–91.7; Mustard Seed, ib. 84. 26–33.

> A good man had a vineyard. He gave it to husbandmen that they might work it, and he receive its fruit at their hand. He sent his servant, that the husbandmen might give him the fruit of the vineyard. They laid hold of his servant, they smote him, and all but killed him. The servant came and told his master. His master said, Perhaps they did not know him. He sent another servant, the husbandmen smote the other also. Then the master sent his son. He said, Perhaps they will reverence my son. But those husbandmen, since they knew that he was the heir of the vineyard, they seized him and slew him.[32] (Cf. Mark 12. 1–9.)

This parable has in the past been suspect on the ground that it is too much of an allegory to be an authentic parable. It is therefore not without interest that it should appear in Thomas in a form so close to that of the Synoptics, although it should be noted that the explicit allusions to Isaiah are missing. Once more it is a shorter version, and if it is based on our Gospels we should have to explain the changes; but the really important point is that Thomas presents precisely the form which scholars had postulated as lying behind the Synoptics. No less interesting is the fact that the next saying concerns a stone:

> Jesus said: Instruct me concerning this stone which the builders refused. It is the corner-stone.[33] (Cf. Mark 12. 10.)

Admittedly Jesus here seeks instruction, while in the Synoptics he recalls the text to the minds of his hearers, but allowance must be made for the editorial activity of the evangelists on the one hand and the textual tradition behind Thomas on the other. In any case the coincidence is striking. Have we here sayings originally independent in process of coming together into larger complexes?

Here a further point may be made: if Thomas used our Gospels he must have used all three Synoptics. The parables of the Hidden Treasure and the Pearl of Great Price occur only in Mat-

[32] Labib, 93. 1–16. Mark's final question is missing, also the point that the husbandmen cast the dead son out of the vineyard. The version in Thomas would seem to confirm the suggestion (cf. Dodd, op. cit., 129 and see also Jeremias, op. cit., 55 ff.) that the form of the Synoptic story has been influenced by allegorical interpretation in which the "servants" stand for the prophets. In this case Thomas has preserved the parable more faithfully. The above translation adopts Quispel's emendation for "Perhaps he did not know them" as necessary to the sense.

[33] Labib, 93. 16–19.

thew, that of the Seed growing secretly only in Mark, and part of the next *logion* is peculiar to Luke. Independent access to a cycle of tradition similar to that of the Synoptics is surely a simpler and more probable explanation than random selection of sayings from all three.

The saying just referred to is composite:

> Jesus said: It is not possible for a man to ride two horses or draw two bows, and it is not possible for a servant to serve two masters; or he will honour the one, and insult the other. A man does not drink old wine and immediately desire to drink new wine; and they do not pour new wine into old skins, lest they burst, nor do they pour old wine into new skins, lest it spoil. They do not sew an old patch on a new garment, for a rent will come.[34] (Cf. Matthew 6. 24, Luke 5. 36–39 and parallels.)

The first part is obviously an expansion of the Synoptic saying on serving two masters. For the rest, the sayings on patches and wine-skins, in that order, are common to all three Synoptics, but the canonical Gospels speak of a new patch on an old garment. Only Luke has the saying about a man drinking old wine, and it should be noted that this saying is missing in certain authorities: D it. Marcion Iren. Eus. Once again, have we here the influence of apocryphal tradition affecting all but one of our Greek manuscripts, and if so, what bearing has this on the value of the Western text? [35] Or if the verse is original to Luke and Thomas derived it thence, why did he invert the order? A further difference is that Thomas omits the Synoptic οἶνον νέον εἰς ἀσκοὺς καινούς, and presents in its place a parallelism which in this case may have some claim to be considered as original. The succinct "lest they burst" of Thomas, again, has some appearance of originality over against Mark's fuller explanation and the attempts of his successors to improve upon it.

[34] Labib, 89. 12–23. Quispel (NTS, 5 (1959), 281) suggests that this saying offers an independent translation of the Aramaic underlying Matthew and Luke and may go back to Jewish-Christian tradition distinct from our Gospels.

[35] Cf. Puech, op. cit., 212: Die noch unveröffentlichten Ergebnisse einer Untersuchung, die G. Quispel hierzu unternommen hat, begünstigen die Auffassung, dass der Text unserer Logien zu der unpassenderweise "westlich" genannten Tradition gehören. For the present, reference may be made to Quispel's articles in Vig. Chr., xi (1957), 189 ff., xii (1958), 181 ff., xiii (1959), 89 ff.

If the sayings in Thomas derive from a tradition independent of the Synoptics, the close parallels become important as confirming the accuracy of the canonical tradition. Among these the following may be mentioned as examples:

> If a blind man lead a blind man, both fall into a pit.
> Blessed are the poor, for yours is the kingdom of heaven.

This, it may be noted, is the Lucan version.

> The harvest is great, but the labourers are few. Pray the Lord, that he send forth labourers to the harvest.
>
> The foxes have holes, and the birds have nests; but the Son of man hath no place to lay his head and rest.[36]

The parable of the Mustard Seed is almost exactly the same as in the Synoptics, save that the question which Mark and Luke place in the mouth of Jesus is in Thomas given to the disciples:

> The disciples said to Jesus: Tell us what the kingdom of heaven is like. He said to them: It is like a grain of mustard seed. It is the smallest of all seeds, but when it falls on the cultivated ground it sends forth a great branch, and becomes a shelter for the birds of heaven.[37] (Cf. Mark 4. 30 etc.)

Here again the explicit Old Testament allusion is missing, as in the parable of the Wicked Husbandmen.

In Thomas these sayings are separate and independent *logia*, each introduced (except for the parable of the Mustard Seed) by the formula "Jesus said." Other close parallels must be treated separately, since they have been re-grouped. Other sayings again appear in a shorter form, like the parable of the Rich Fool already mentioned or the saying about the Mote and the Beam:

> The mote which is in thy brother's eye, thou seest; but the beam which is in thine eye, thou seest not. When thou hast drawn out the beam from thine own eye, then wilt thou see to draw out the mote from thy brother's eye.[38] (Cf. Matthew 7. 3 ff. and par.)

[36] Labib, 87. 18–20, 90. 23–24, 94. 6–9, 96. 1–4. Cf. Matt. 15.14, Luke 6.20 (Matt. 5.3), Matt. 9. 37 f. and par., Matt. 8.20 and par. The closing words of the last saying are not Synoptic, but Quispel (Vig. Chr., xiii (1959), 94) finds parallels in some forms of the Diatessaron.

[37] Labib, 84. 26–33.

[38] Labib, 86. 12–17.

Is this merely an abbreviation of the Synoptic saying, or has elaboration taken place in the Synoptic tradition as early as the hypothetical Q? Both Matthew and Luke put the first sentence in the form of a question, and both add a further question before the final "Thou hypocrite! first cast out the beam . . . ." The version in Thomas is terse and to the point, but in such a case decision is extremely difficult.

Another example is of interest in that it is extant in Greek in one of the Oxyrhynchus papyri, and in a fuller form. The Coptic has only:

> Be not anxious from morning to evening and from evening to morning about what you shall put on.[39] (Cf. Matthew 6. 25 and par.)

The Greek, as Doresse observes,[40] develops almost to the same length as the parallel Synoptic texts. This may serve as a reminder that the Gospel of Thomas also has its history. Puech has suggested that it was current in two versions, one of which was favored by the Gnostics, the other used by orthodox Christians, while Doresse has detected in the Coptic version gnosticizing traits which are absent from the Greek.[41] In any case this example shows not only compression but also expansion, in the addition of "from morning to evening and from evening to morning."

Cases of expansion are fairly numerous, and take different forms. Sometimes a few words only are added, and these help to drive home the point:

> He who has in his hand, to him shall be given, and he who has not, from him shall be taken *even the little* that he has.[42] (Cf. Matthew 13. 12, Mark 4. 25.)

Other cases, however, show clear marks of a later stage of development:

[39] Labib, 87. 24–27. Cf. Schneemelcher, op. cit., 71.

[40] Op. cit., 169.

[41] Puech, op. cit., 221 f. and previously in CR Acad. Inscr., 1957; Doresse, op. cit., 69. Thus Puech notes (op. cit., 222) that in one case the Coptic omits a reference to the resurrection of the body which occurs in the parallel Oxyrhynchus fragment, because it conflicted with Gnostic doctrine.

[42] Labib, 88. 16–18.

> He who blasphemes against the Father will be forgiven, and he who blasphemes against the Son will be forgiven; but he who blasphemes against the Holy Spirit will not be forgiven, either on earth or in heaven.[43] (Cf. Mark 3. 28 f., Matthew 12. 31 f., etc.)

This is obviously an expansion of the synoptic saying, designed to introduce a trinitarian formula, but it must leave one wondering about the theology of the author. If the passage is secondary, however, it raises, in its context in Thomas, a question which deserves closer study. In Mark the saying occurs in the Beelzebub Controversy, and is followed by the saying about Christ's real brethren, which appears elsewhere in Thomas.[44] In Luke it has been detached from this context, and appears in a different setting altogether. In Matthew it is followed by sayings about trees and fruit, culminating in the application: "The good man out of the good treasure bringeth good things . . . ." The Lucan parallel to these sayings is somewhat fuller, and includes the verses about figs and thistles which in Matthew occur in the Sermon on the Mount. The version in Thomas runs:

> They do not gather grapes from thorns, nor pluck figs from camel-thistles; they do not yield fruit. A good man brings forth a good thing from his treasure; a bad man brings forth evil things from his evil treasure which is in his heart, and he says evil things; for out of the abundance of his heart he brings forth evil things.[45] (Cf. Luke 6. 43–45, Matthew 7. 16–18, 12. 33–35.)

This version finds its closest parallels in Luke, and if it stood alone no more would need to be said, save that there is some slight expansion. But is it purely by accident that in Thomas it follows immediately upon a saying with which part of it is associated in Matthew? Has Thomas drawn upon both Synoptics and woven their material together? Or does he point us to the common tradition? Or is he here dependent on such a work as Tatian's Diatessaron, with which Professor Quispel has detected

[43] Labib, 88. 26–31.
[44] Labib, 97. 21–26.
[45] Labib, 88. 31–89.6. It may be added that the association of grapes with thorns and figs with thistles corresponds to Matthew rather than to Luke. Jeremias (op. cit., 73) sees in the Synoptics a case of the fusion of parables.

other parallels? [46] Once more the choice is difficult, and further study is clearly required; but here again we may have originally independent material in process of development into larger complexes. It is not impossible that Tatian knew either an early redaction of Thomas or the tradition upon which the work was based.[47]

Expansion of another kind appears in the saying:

> A prophet is not accepted in his own village; a physician does not cure those who know him.[48] (Cf. Luke 4. 24, etc.)

The first part only occurs in the canonical Gospels, and it might seem that the second part is simply an elaboration. In that case the clue would be found in Luke, where the preceding verse contains the words "Ye will surely say to me this parable, Physician, heal thyself." On the other hand, Jesus does elsewhere in the Synoptics employ the figure of the physician,[49] and this expansion produces an effective parallelism. In other cases one cannot but share the doubts expressed by Leipoldt regarding the authenticity of the parallelism,[50] but this is in quite a different category. It might well be that we have here an authentic saying.

In other cases the expansion seems to take the form of combining Synoptic sayings, or parts thereof, but here again care is necessary. Of the saying

> If two make peace with one another in the same house, they will say to the mountain, Be thou removed, and it will depart.[51] (Cf. Matthew 18. 19, 21. 21.)

Puech observes that it might seem the product of two Matthaean

[46] Cf. Vig. Chr., xiii (1959), 89 ff., NTS, 5 (1959), 282 ff.

[47] According to Quispel (op. cit., 97 f.), although the possibility is not excluded, there is nothing to indicate that Tatian knew Thomas, and there are reasons which make it extremely improbable. Quispel suggests (e.g., p. 117) that the *logia* which have links with Tatian's work were derived from the Gospel according to the Hebrews. Cf. also NTS 5 (1959), 286: "the Gospel according to the Hebrews or more generally . . . the tradition which this apocryphal writing represents."

[48] Labib, 87. 5–7.

[49] Mark 2.17 and parr.

[50] Op. cit., 494. Leipoldt remarks that our suspicions of these parallelisms are confirmed by the cases in which the first member is simply reversed, sometimes producing a quite unintelligible result.

[51] Labib, 89. 24–27. On developments of this saying within Thomas itself, see Quispel NTS, 5 (1959), 288.

verses, but for the fact that it occurs in the Syriac Didascalia and therefore seems to belong to a particular tradition.[52] Again, of the saying

> A city that is built upon a lofty mountain and is fortified cannot fall, nor can it remain hidden.[53] (Cf. Matthew 5. 14.)

he remarks that although apparently it is an amplification of Matthew 5. 14 by the addition of part of Matthew 7. 24–25 it could, in view of its Semitic structure and coloring, have been preserved here in an older and more complete form.[54] In this case M. Vaganay, working only with the Oxyrhynchus papyri, had already suggested the common use of the same source.[55] In Matthew, it may be added, this saying is followed by that of the Lamp and the Bushel, which appears just afterwards in Thomas; [56] but here these sayings are separated by an expansion of Matthew 10. 27.

Other sayings present a combination of Matthew and Luke:

> The Pharisees and scribes have received the keys of knowledge. They have hidden them. They did not go in, and those who wanted to go in they did not allow. But you, be ye wise as serpents and innocent as doves.[57] (Cf. Luke 11. 52, Matthew 10. 16.)

> Perhaps men think that I am come to cast peace upon the world, and know not that I am come to cast divisions upon the earth, fire, sword, war. For there will be five in a house, and three shall be against two, two against three, the father against the son and the son against the father, and they shall be alone.[58] (Cf. Matthew 10. 34, Luke 12. 51 f.)

Finally there are passages which have no parallels in the

[52] CR Acad. Inscr., 1957, 159, and in Hennecke-Schneemelcher, 218 (references only).

[53] Labib, 87. 7–10.

[54] Loc. cit. On Semitisms in Thomas, cf. Guillaumont, Journal Asiatique, ccxlvi (1958), 113 ff.

[55] Le Problème synoptique (Paris, 1954), 339 ff. (reference in Puech, 159, note). See also Quispel, Vig. Chr., xiii, 108 f.

[56] Quispel (op. cit., 112 f.) suggests that behind the version of this saying in the Diatessaron there lies a version identical with, or similar to, that of Thomas. Cf. NTS, 5 (1959), 285.

[57] Labib, 88. 7–13.

[58] Labib, 83. 31–84. 5. For "fire" cf. Luke 12. 49 and Thomas (Labib, 82. 14–16): "I have cast a fire upon the world, and behold, I watch over it until it burn."

Gospels, but recall other parts of the New Testament. In reply to a question about the value of circumcision, Jesus says

> If it were profitable, their father would have begotten them from their mother circumcised; but the true circumcision in the Spirit is alone of value.[59]

This reminds one of Paul's teaching. Again, part of another saying recalls Paul's words about treasure in earthen vessels:

> I wonder that this great wealth has settled in this poverty.[60]

These and similar sayings might prompt the suggestion that the words of Jesus may be echoed much more often in the New Testament than we have hitherto imagined; [61] but another *logion* provides a warning against over-hasty conclusions:

> I will give you that which the eye has not seen, and the ear has not heard, and the hand has not touched, and which has not entered into the heart of man.[62]

This is a modification and expansion of I Corinthians 2. 9, where the words are introduced by the formula *καθὼς γέγραπται*. It may be that this is a quotation from some lost apocryphon, it may be that it is an echo of an authentic saying of Jesus, preserved only by Paul and in this apocryphal Gospel; but it may also be that we have in Thomas a Pauline saying growing into a word of Jesus. In point of fact the New Testament itself appears to provide at least one example of the same process in the saying about

[59] Labib, 90. 18–23. Doresse (op. cit., 176 f.) refers to I Cor. 7.10 (a misprint for 7.19), Gal. 5.6., 6.15 and Col. 3.11. To these may be added Rom. 2.25 ff. and Col. 2.11.

[60] Labib, 86. 34–87.2 Cf. 2 Cor. 4.7; but if Paul's words lie behind this, they have been adapted to a Gnostic purpose. See Till, op. cit., 453.

[61] On *logion* 59 of his translation (Labib, 91. 7–9), Leipoldt refers to James 1.12 and I Peter 3.14, and suggests that Thomas may here preserve the more original form: "Blessed is the man who suffered; he found life." Doresse (op. cit., 179) finds "une citation approximative" in Gregory of Nazianzus. Reference should perhaps be made, however, to Matt. 5.10 f. (cf. Labib, 93. 21–27), and to the *agraphon* quoted by Tertullian, De baptismo 20.2 (one of eleven sayings listed by Jeremias in Hennecke-Schneemelcher, 54 f., of which at least two others have parallels in Thomas).

[62] Labib, 84. 5–9. Cf. Puech, CR Acad. Inscr., 1957, 165, and Doresse, op. cit., 145 ff.

Baptism with the Spirit, which in Mark is ascribed to John the Baptist and in Acts is quoted as a word of Jesus.[63]

In one case it may be that we have a parable on its way from a Palestinian to a Hellenistic environment. In the Synoptic parable of the Great Supper [64] three guests are summoned, and their excuses in two cases have a rural background: five yoke of oxen which must be proved, a newly-bought field which must be inspected. The third excuse has an Old Testament basis, for if a newly-married man was exempt from military service, surely he could be excused from a supper! In Thomas we seem to enter a different environment: one must settle with merchants who owe him money, a second has bought a house, a third has bought a village (κώμη) and (if Till's translation is correct [65]) must see to the collection of the rent. A wedding is indeed mentioned, but here it is the man's friend who is about to marry, and the excuse is that he must prepare a feast. This may perhaps be held to reflect an environment in which the function of the "friend of the bridegroom" was no longer fully understood, but at any rate the whole suggests a commercial rather than an agricultural background.

At the present stage it would be premature to speak of final conclusions in relation to the study of this document, but of its importance there can be no question. If Thomas is based on our Gospels, the study of these sayings will serve to show the later development of the tradition in a period when the fourfold canon of the Gospels had not yet attained to final authority.[66]

[63] Mark 1.8, Acts 1.5, 11.16. Cf. also the references given by Jeremias (in Hennecke-Schneemelcher, 67 f.) on POx. 1 = Labib, 86. 20–31, and his comment (. . . der Art, wie Jesus christologische Formulierungen der Gemeinde in den Mund gelegt werden . . .).

[64] Luke 14. 16–24, cf. Matt. 22. 2–10. Commentators differ as to whether the variations between Matthew and Luke indicate use of different sources or independent editing of the same Q material. The version in Thomas is closer to that of Luke, usually considered nearer to the original.

[65] Op. cit., 450 f., cf. Doresse, op. cit., 104, 184.

[66] For the view that the Apostolic Fathers are dependent on oral tradition even after the composition of our Gospels, cf. Köster, Synoptische Überlieferung bei den apostolischen Vätern (TU, 65, Berlin, 1957). P. Borgen (NTS, 5 (1959), 246 ff.) suggests that synoptic elements, already fused together in the tradition, have been assimilated in John into a Passion narrative derived from a separate tradition. A similar explanation may account for some of the features observed in Thomas.

The variations of order, however, even when sayings are close to the Synoptic parallels, may be taken to suggest independent use of a common tradition, in which case we now have the means of controlling the tradition at an earlier stage of its development. Thomas would then provide confirmation of the reliability with which some sayings have been handed down in the canonical tradition, and examination of the differences may enable us to discover the motives which were at work in the development, or to detect more clearly the editorial methods of the evangelists.[67] The examples here discussed provide evidence of Gnostic adaptation and re-moulding of parables, while other cases may perhaps show the construction of new parables on familiar Synoptic patterns. Where sayings are expanded in Thomas this version is often manifestly secondary, but sometimes the parallelism supports its authenticity,[68] and where Thomas presents a shorter form it is frequently difficult to decide which is the more original. On the other hand there are some cases in which we seem to have a saying from some other part of the New Testament growing into a saying of Jesus. Each saying therefore must be examined by itself, but the study will advance our knowledge of the background of thought and the editorial methods of those who handed down the earliest tradition. And if Thomas does in fact supply an indication of the kind of materials upon which the evangelists had to work, this study cannot but increase our admiration for the skill with which they fulfilled their task.

[67] Some sayings appear in two forms in Thomas, and may show development actually in process. Cf. Quispel, NTS, 5 (1959), 287 ff.

[68] Another factor to be taken into consideration here is the Semitic element, on which cf. Guillaumont in Journal Asiatique, ccxlvi (1958), 113 ff, Quispel in Vig. Chr., xiii (1959), 115. For other literature on Thomas see the references given in New Testament Studies, v (1959), 273 ff., and Prigent, Rev. Hist. et Phil. Rel., xxxix (1959), 39 ff.

Gospel of Thomas: Comparative Table of Numbering

Labib		*Doresse*	*Leipoldt*	*Puech, etc.*
		Prol.	*Prol.*	*Prol.+1*
Pl. 80	POx. 654	1	1	2
		2	2	3
		3		
Pl. 81		4	3	4
		5	4	5
		6	5	6
		7	6	7
		8	7	8
Pl. 82		9	8	9
		10	9	10
		11	10	11
		12		
		13	11	12
		14	12	13
Pl. 83			13	
		15	14	14
		16	15	15
		17	16	16
Pl. 84		18	17	17
		19	18	18
		20	19	19
		21		
		22		
		23	20	20
		24	21	21
Pl. 85		25	22	
		26		
		27	23	22
Pl. 86		28	24	23
		29	25	24
		30	26	25
	POx. 1	31	27	26
		32	28	27
		33	29	28
		34	30	29
Pl. 87		35	31	30
		36	32	31
		37	33	32
		38	34	33
		39	35	34
		40	36	35
	POx. 655	41	37	36
		42	38	37
Pl. 88		43	39	38
		44	40	39
		45	41	40
		46	42	41
		47	43	42
		48	44	43
		49	45	44
		50	46	45
Pl. 89		51	47	46
		52	48	47
		53	49	48
		54	50	49
		55	51	50
Pl. 90		56	52	51
		57	53	52
		58	54	53
		59	55	54
		60	56	55
		61	57	56
		62	58	57
Pl. 91		63	59	58
		64	60	59
				60
		65	61	61
			62	
		66	63	62
Pl. 92		67	64	63
		68	65	64
Pl. 93		69	66	65
		70	67	66
		71	68	67
		72	69	68
		73	70	69
		74	71	70
		75	72	71
		76		72
Pl. 94		77	73	73
		78	74	74
		79	75	75
		80	76	76
	POx. 1	81	77	77
		82	78	78
Pl. 95		83	79	79
		84	80	80
		85	81	81
		86	82	82
		87	83	83
		88	84	84
		89	85	85
		90	86	86

Labib	*Doresse*	*Leipoldt*	*Puech, etc.*
	Prol.	*Prol.*	*Prol.+1*
Pl. 96	91	87	87
	92	88	88
	93	89	89
	94	90	90
	95	91	91
	96	92	92
Pl. 97	97		93
	98		94
	99		95
	100	93	96
	101	94	97
	102	95	98
	103	96	99
	104	97	100
	105	98	101

Labib	*Doresse*	*Leipoldt*	*Puech, etc.*
	Prol.	*Prol.*	*Prol.+1*
Pl. 98	106	99	102
	107	100	103
	108	101	104
	109	102	105
	110	103	106
	111	104	107
	112	105	108
	113	106	109
Pl. 99	114	107	110
	115	108	111
		109	
	116	110	112
	117	111	113
	118	112	114

Solid lines show pages of photographic edition (sayings of course sometimes continue on following page).

Broken lines mark limits of legible Oxyrhynchus fragments.

Logia 29 and 38 (Puech) are not extant in the Greek.

Logion 77 (Puech) is part of POx.1 in the Greek.

A LETTER OF MELETIUS OF ANTIOCH

W. A. JURGENS

Saint Mary's Seminary
1227 Ansel Road, Cleveland, Ohio

In letter no. 120 in the corpus of his letters, Basil the Great addresses himself to Meletius of Antioch as follows:

> I received a letter from the God-beloved Bishop Eusebius enjoining me to write again to the bishops of the West concerning certain ecclesiastical affairs. He wanted me to write the letter, which is to be signed by all who are in (our) communion; but, since I do not see how I could write about the matters which he mentioned, I have sent the memorandum to Your Reverence, so that you yourself, after reading it and hearing the reports of the most beloved brother Sanctissimus, our fellow-priest, may deign to write about these matters as will seem best to yourself. I am ready to subscribe my signature to this letter and to have it carried quickly to those who are in (our) communion, so that the one who is to go to the bishops of the West may have all the signatures when he sets out. Give orders that I be informed immediately of what Your Holiness has in mind, so that I may not be ignorant of your decisions.[1]

The Eusebius of whom Basil speaks is undoubtedly Eusebius of Samosata, a very close friend of Basil. From this passage in letter no. 120, we see that Eusebius of Samosata had written to Basil, requesting him to prepare a letter to the western bishops about certain ecclesiastical affairs, the precise nature of which is not stated. The letter was to be signed by all the bishops in the communion of Basil, Eusebius, and Meletius. Basil declared himself unprepared to discuss the matters about which Eusebius wanted to have him treat; and he sent Eusebius' letter along with his own no. 120 to Meletius, requesting him to write the letter intended for the western bishops. He declared himself at the same time willing to subscribe to the proposed letter, and to have it carried around for the signatures of the other bishops in their communion. Finally, he requested Meletius to inform him immediately of whether or not he will fall in with this plan.

It is easily seen that this passage from Basil's certainly authentic letter no. 120 opens numerous avenues of speculation. We

[1] Basil, Ep. 120, PL 32, col 537 C–540 A.

wonder, first of all, what these ecclesiastical affairs can have been, about which Eusebius of Samosata wanted the West to be informed. The fact that Basil declares himself more or less incompetent to discuss these matters, while apparently considering their treatment to be more within the province of Meletius, suggests that a part, at least, of the matters to be written about, was something that touched very closely upon Meletius or upon his jurisdiction; and from such an observation it is a very short step to suppose that the matter in question was the Antiochian Schism: both Meletius and Paulinus claiming to be the legitimate occupant of the orthodox episcopal chair at Antioch. If we accept the probability of such a conjecture, it is easy to understand Basil's attitude: being friendly to the cause of Meletius, he thought it better to have Meletius, the interested party, compose the letter to the western bishops, lest a letter from a third party in any way prejudice Meletius' case.

We must wonder also what Meletius' reply to Basil's letter was: did he agree to compose the letter to the West? If we suppose for the moment that Meletius did agree with the proposal of Basil, we must wonder then what happened to his letter? Has it been utterly lost to posterity? Does it yet lie hidden in some dusty tome unknown to scholars? Or has it been brought in some way to light only to remain in the half-obscurity of being unrecognized for what it really is: a letter of Meletius?

To suppose that the letter has been utterly and finally lost closes the door upon any further investigation. To suppose that it remains undiscovered postpones indefinitely and quite effectively the same investigation. I will be pardoned, then, I think, if I suppose tentatively, for argument's sake, that the letter exists and is known, but has not been recognized as a letter of Meletius. This is, of course, a remarkable assumption; so I must hasten to add that I do not make this assumption unreasonably. I have some reason to believe that the supposed letter to Meletius is an actual fact; and that it has been published as letter no. 92 in the corpus of Basil's letters. I first noted a peculiar and striking relationship between letters no. 120 and no. 92 when I read the two letters (for no reason that I can now recall) one after the other in that order: letter no. 120, and then letter no. 92. Letter no. 92 is in

every respect precisely the letter we would expect Meletius to have written, in accord with Basil's request in letter no. 120. It is a letter to the West, about certain ecclesiastical affairs; and these affairs are Arianism and the Antiochian or Meletian Schism. At any rate, Arianism is called by name in the letter, and it can scarcely be doubted that the last paragraph of the letter contains remarks pertinent to the Meletian Schism, which, after all, we could scarcely expect Meletius to call by that name. The author of the letter says that it is necessary that a full synod be held, not only in order to re-establish the Creed of Nicea and to extirpate Arianism, but also to discuss with the churches matters pertaining to peace,

> . . . bringing together into harmony those who profess the same belief. Of all things, surely, this is the most deserving of pity, that even the part which appears to be sound is divided against itself, and there surround us, as it seems, calamities like those which formerly encompassed Jerusalem at the time of the siege of Vespasian. They were at the same time oppressed by war from without, and spent by the dissension of their own people within.[2]

No one, I think, will deny that this passage just quoted was written in reference to the situation at Antioch, where there was "war from without" because of the Arian Church so well-represented in that city, as well as "dissension of their own people within" because of the fact that there were at that time present in Antioch two orthodox bishops, each claiming that his was the legitimate right to lead the orthodox church in that city.

Examining letters 120 and 92 closely, there can be little doubt, I think, that letter 92 is the letter which Basil requested Meletius to write. In letter no. 120 Basil proposes that Meletius write a letter to the bishops of the West; and from Basil's attitude expressed in letter 120 it can be conjectured that the proposed letter is to concern the Antiochian Schism. Letter no. 92 is a letter to

[2] Basil, Ep. 92, 3, PL 32, col 481 C: ". . . *τοὺς τὰ αὐτὰ φρονοῦντας συνάγοντες εἰς ὁμόνοιαν. Τοῦτο γὰρ δήπου τὸ πάντων ἐλεεινότατον, ὅτι καὶ τὸ δοκοῦν ὑγιαίνειν ἐφ' ἑαυτὸ ἐμερίσθη· καὶ περιέστηκεν ἡμᾶς, ὡς ἔοικε, παραπλήσια πάθη τοῖς ποτὲ κατὰ τὴν Οὐεσπασιανοῦ πολιορκίαν τὰ Ἱεροσόλυμα περισκοῦσιν. ἐκεῖνοί τε γὰρ ὁμοῦ μὲν τῷ ἔξωθεν συνείχοντο πολέμῳ, ὁμοῦ δὲ καὶ τῇ ἔνδοθεν στάσει τῶν ὁμοφύλων κατανηλίσκοντο.*"

the West; and it concerns the Antiochian Schism. Letter 120 proposes that the letter to the West be signed by the bishops who are in communion with Meletius, Eusebius and Basil. Letter 92 is signed by thirty-two bishops, the first three signatures being Meletius, Eusebius and Basil. But even if we prove that letter no. 92 is the letter proposed in letter no. 120, we will not thereby have proved that Meletius is the author of letter no. 92; for there would remain still the possibility that in response to letter 120 Meletius merely told Basil to go ahead and write the letter himself. We can, however, do much toward discounting this possibility; for we can show, on internal evidence, that letter no. 92 is not consistent with Basilian authorship.

In the final lines of letter 92, its author states that he has submitted himself "to all the doctrines which have been canonically and legally promulgated in the synodal letter"; and the reference is generally accepted as being to the synodal letter of Nicea. The Benedictine editors of Basil's letters expressed some surprise that Basil can declare himself in agreement with the doctrines of the synodal letter, since (they say) it defines the Son as τῆς αὐτῆς ὑποστάσεως καὶ οὐσίας (of the same essence and substance). Later authors rather consistently point out that the phrase τῆς αὐτῆς . . . οὐσίας pertains not to the synodal letter (Socrates I, 9) but to the anathemas originally appended to the Creed. On this point I wish to make three observations.

1. In saying that he submits to the doctrines of the synodal letter, it can be inferred from the context of the remark, that the author declares his submission to the doctrines of the Council. He does not intend to restrict his submission only to the synodal letter of the Council. The term synodal letter is used synecdochically for all the official teaching instruments of the Council.

2. Whatever document the Benedictine editors had in mind when they cited the phrase τῆς αὐτῆς ὑποστάσεως καὶ οὐσίας, it can scarcely have been the anathemas appended to the creed (Socrates I, 8); for there it is not stated that the Son is *of the same essence and substance* as is the Father, but that anathema are those who assert that He is *of other substance or essence* than the Father; and this is quite a different thing. To subscribe to the latter would only make clear that one was not an Anomoian;

and the Benedictine editors certainly cannot have been surprised to find Basil asserting that he is not to be numbered among those extreme Arians. To subscribe to the former would not precisely exclude Homoiousianism; and that is why the Benedictine editors were surprised. They could not conceive of Basil's having ever admitted any phrase into his avowed theology which would have left the door open to Homoiousianism.

3. The Benedictine editors did not find their phrase *τῆς αὐτῆς*, *κτλ.*, by biting it off the corner of a building; and I can hardly believe that in writing their famous note to letter 92 they relied entirely upon memory, and so erred in that way. If they say that the phrase is in the synodal letter of the Council of Nicea, I rather suspect that it *is* in the synodal letter of the Council — in their copy of it, that is; for it certainly is not in mine. However, there is no point in my dwelling further upon this knotty aspect of the problem, because I can see little or no difficulty at all in allowing Basil to submit himself to the phrase *τῆς αὐτῆς ὑποστάσεως καὶ οὐσίας*. Understanding of the Arian period has progressed rapidly since the days of the great Maurists. That they would not allow any hint of Homoiousianism to fall upon Basil we can understand; but it is equally clear to us today that Basil, while he preferred the term *ὁμοούσιος* as one less likely to be misunderstood, was not (at least until his quarrel with Eustathius of Sebaste in 373) unalterably opposed to the term *ὁμοιούσιος*.[3]

In fine, while they assumed Basilian authorship, the Maurists regarded the concluding remark of the letter as being quite un-Basilian. I cannot honestly agree with them, though to do so would seemingly strengthen my own position of non-Basilian authorship of the letter. It is, nevertheless, interesting to see their opinion that the letter is not typical of Basil's theology.

Much more to my point and purpose is the testimony provided by the style of the letter. In an article in the American Journal

[3] No matter the author of the letter, it cannot have been written later than the earlier part of the year 373. Since the letter carries the signatures of both Basil the Great and Eustathius of Sebaste, it bears witness that those two were still in communion at the time the letter was written. It was, however, in the Spring or Summer of 373 that Eustathius excommunicated St. Basil. (See Jurgens, Eustathius of Sebaste, Rome, 1959, p. 66).

of Philology in 1931, Sister Agnes Clare Way argued against authenticity of letters 361 and 363 in the Basilian corpus, on grounds of their style. Among other points, she noted that the very formal greeting quite common in Greek letters of Basil's period occurs in only three authentic letters of Basil: Nos. 264, 243, and 92.[4] The fact that the formal greeting is found otherwise in only two authentic letters of Basil does not justify calling letter 92 unauthentic; but it certainly points in that direction; and it certainly labels letter 92 as untypical of St. Basil.

Further evidence against Basilian authorship of the letter is to be found in the list of signatories to the letter. A letter to the bishops of the West, it was signed by thirty-two eastern bishops. Had Basil composed the letter, we would expect his signature to be either first or last among the signatories; we would definitely not expect to find that the author of the letter was the third among the thirty-two to sign it: in which position Basil's signature does in fact occur.

So much can we say, then, against the probability of Basilian authorship of letter no. 92. What can be said in behalf of Meletius' authorship? No argument from style and usages will be forthcoming, for there are no appreciable literary remains of Meletius with which the letter can be compared. The argument from the order of the signatories, which worked against Basilian authorship of the letter, works contrariwise in behalf of Meletian authorship; for Meletius' name is first among the thirty-two signatories: precisely where we would have expected the author of the letter to sign. It is interesting to note also that Eusebius is the second signatory of the letter — and it will be recalled that it was Eusebius of Samosata who first asked Basil to write the letter which Basil in turn asked Meletius to write.

The clearest indication (from internal evidence) for Meletian authorship is the fact that he was the first to sign the letter — a fact in itself far from conclusive. I am much impressed, however, that letter no. 92 is the perfect example of what that letter ought to have been, which Basil requested Meletius to write. At

[4] Sr. Agnes Clare Way, "On the Authenticity of the Letters Attributed to Saint Basil in the So-Called Basil-Apollinaris Correspondence;" in the American Journal of Philology, Vol. 52, no. 1 (Jan.–Mar., 1931), pp. 57–65.

the beginning of this present article I cited a passage from Basil's letter no. 120. If the reader will refer again to that passage, he will note that in letter 120 the following facts are disclosed:

1. Eusebius of Samosata wrote to Basil the Great, asking him to prepare a letter to the bishops of the West, seeking their aid in certain difficulties afflicting the Eastern Church: Arianism very probably; and probably also (as we conjecture from Basil's statement of his own attitude), the Antiochian or Meletian Schism.

2. Basil in turn requested Meletius to write the letter, because he "did not see how he could write of those things" himself. He did not feel himself competent to discuss the Schism of Antioch; or perhaps he was reluctant to do so because of his friendship with Meletius, lest he prejudice Meletius' case.

3. Basil declared himself ready to put his own signature on the letter and to have it carried as quickly as possible to those bishops who were in communion with himself and Meletius and Eusebius, for the obtaining of further signatures.

4. Basil asked Meletius to inform him immediately of whether or not he was agreeable to this plan.

If we may be permitted for the moment to assume what we have set out to prove — that letter 92 is the result of letter 120, and that it was written by Meletius — we can continue our summation of the order of events, drawing now upon letter 92 itself and the order of the signatures therein as the source for our remarks:

5. Meletius' signature occurs first among the thirty-two: so Meletius, having, no doubt, informed Basil that he was willing to compose the letter, actually drew up the letter and signed it.

6. Eusebius' signature occurs second among the thirty-two: so Meletius, as was natural, must have sent the letter on to Eusebius, who, as Meletius knew from letter 120, had originated the plan of the letter. Eusebius signed the letter.

7. Basil's signature occurs third among the thirty-two: so, Eusebius having signed the letter, sent it on to Basil, who had signified that he was willing not only to subscribe to it but also to have it sent quickly around for the signatures of the other bishops in their communion.

8. After Basil's signature there occur twenty-nine others: from

which fact we see that Basil did precisely what he said he would do: i.e., he subscribed before sending the letter on for the other signatures. The picture is complete.

Up to this point, as the reader has probably noted, we have scrupulously avoided any mention of the dates to which the two letters nos. 120 and 92 ought to be assigned. It is evident that if it could be shown that letter 92 was written earlier than letter 120, it would be a mortal blow to the argument which has been set forth in this article. On the other hand, to prove letter 92 to have been written later than letter 120 would provide nothing more than consistency on a point where lack of consistency were deadly; it would add little or no support to any argument for Meletian authorship. As a matter of fact, I fear that nothing conclusive can be said about the dates of the two letters in question. The Benedictine editors dated letter 92 in the year 372, and letter 120 in 373.[5] We showed in a footnote above why letter 92 must be dated earlier than the Summer of 373. Loofs dated letter 92 in 372, and letter 120 in 375.[6] His opinion on the latter appears never to have been very well received. Deferrari, in the Loeb edition of Basil's letters, dates both of the letters in question in the year 372, while professing to be in accord with Tillemont and the Benedictines.[7] I have yet to see any really convincing argument for a reasonably precise date for either letter; and I doubt very much if such is forthcoming. None of these afore-mentioned authors noted the apparent relationship between the two letters, or they might well have dated them differently. I do not believe that any strong argument for or against Meletian authorship of letter 92 can be developed from a consideration of the dates of the two letters. On the contrary, I am of a mind that the dependence of letter 92 upon letter 120 is clear enough from the letters themselves, that we may use this relationship to assist in dating the letters: letter 120 must be dated as prior to 92; and both may with some probability be assigned to the year 372.

A possible objection to Meletian authorship of letter no. 92

[5] PG 32, col. 478 D; col. 538 D.

[6] Loofs, Fr., Eustathius von Sebaste und die Chronologie der Basilius-Briefe, Halle, 1898, pp. 42–46; pp. 28 ff.

[7] Vol. 1, p. 133; p. 244.

may find origin in the fact of the letter's being very well-attested in the manuscript tradition of Basil's letters. That the letter is well-attested in that tradition cannot be denied. Bessières examined twenty-seven manuscript collections of Basil's letters for his study of the manuscript tradition.[8] He divided the manuscripts into two main families, comprising together seven sub-families. Letter no. 92 is found in twenty of the manuscripts; it is lacking in five of them; it may or may not be present in the other two, for which Bessières did not list the complete contents. Moreover, the earliest and more dependable manuscripts consistently contain the letter in question. Nevertheless, this is not in itself a good argument for authenticity. No amount of manuscript evidence of this kind can demonstrate the authenticity of any document. The presence of letter 92 in the manuscript tradition of Basil's letters can easily be accounted for, aside from the possibility of actual authenticity. It was Basil who sent the letter about to collect the last twenty-nine of the thirty-two signatures; and from this fact it is clear that the letter was immediately associated with Basil himself. Basil, moreover, wrote other letters to the West, several of which are extant in his collected letters. From these facts it can be seen that letter no. 92 could easily find its way into various manuscript collections of Basil's letters.

We have not proved conclusively that Meletius is the author of the letter in question: letter no. 92 in the corpus of Basil's letters. A really conclusive proof is not forthcoming. We believe, however, that we have given convincing evidence for Meletian authorship of the letter; and our argument can be summarized very briefly:

Examination of letters 120 and 92 in the corpus of Basil's letters reveals a remarkably clear relationship between the two letters. It appears almost certain that letter no. 92 is the letter which, in letter 120, Basil asked Meletius to draw up. The question then, is whether or not Meletius complied with or refused Basil's request. Did Meletius write the letter, or did he refuse and tell Basil to write it himself? The order of the signatures,

[8] Bessières, J., "La Tradition Manuscrite de la Correspondance de Saint Basile." In The Journal of Theological Studies, Oxford, Chapter I, in Vol. 21, no. 81 (Oct., 1919), pp. 1–50.

Meletius, followed by Eusebius, followed by Basil, indicates Meletian authorship. This, taken in conjunction with the fact that the style of the greeting in the letter is un-Basilian, while some have found even the theology of the letter un-Basilian, seems to be sufficient reason to attribute the letter to Meletius rather than to Basil.

THE TRINITARIAN THEOLOGY OF AUGUSTINE AND HIS DEBT TO PLOTINUS

THOMAS A. WASSMER, S.J.

St. Peter's College
Jersey City, New Jersey

A very powerful case has been made out for the influence of the Platonism of Plotinus upon Saint Augustine. From the Manichaean simple solution of the problem of evil Augustine was delivered by reading the Neo-Platonists and especially Plotinus. It was Plotinus who convinced him that God was a spirit, not a luminous body, and he always remained grateful for this deliverance from the crude fantasies of the Manichaeans. In the two years before his conversion when he was receiving a deeper penetration into Christianity through the sermons of St. Ambrose, he came to know of Plotinus in a very few treatises of the Enneads (certainly I/6 "On the Beautiful" and quite probably V/I "On the Three Chief Hypostases") in the Latin translation of Marius Victorinus. St. Ambrose made a determined effort to apply the principles of Plotinus' philosophy to the clarification of the Christian doctrine of the Trinity as against the Arians. The results of such an attempt might not be theologically satisfying but they are interesting. This impact of the mind of Plotinus upon the mind of Augustine was a decisive one because Augustine found a very great area of agreement between the teaching of Plotinus and that of the Scriptures as expounded by St. Ambrose, above all the Gospel of St. John. It was their agreement that God is spirit and altogether immaterial, as Plotinus explains, which liberated him from the Manichaean materialism. Augustine thought that Plotinus' teaching about the Divine Mind was identical with that of St. John about the Divine Logos. Shortly after his conversion, and some think probably at the actual time, he was clearly conscious of certain fundamental differences between Plotinian Neo-Platonism and Christianity. He explains the differences and resemblances as he came to see them in the Confessiones, Book VII, chapter 9, which together with Chapters 10 and 20 of the same book give a remarkable view of the relation-

ship between his own thought and that of Plotinus. He was always willing to admit the great measure of agreement between himself and Plotinus but the influence was always within the clearly defined limits established by the Scriptures interpreted by Catholic tradition. Let us consider this most interesting question of the debt that Augustine owes to Plotinus.

Augustine never ceases to stress the Unity of God as the transcendent Principle of all order and number and so of being. This emphasis derives from Plotinus because to be anything other than Absolute Unity is to be an ordered whole of parts and so in some sense a unity. Still, in stressing the Unity he equally affirms the Being and the Trinity of God. In considering the Trinity-in-Unity he lays the emphasis on the Unity of the Godhead and not, as the Cappadocian Fathers and the later East, on the Three Divine Persons. Augustine starts from the one and simple divine nature which is the Trinity:

> Unus quippe Deus est ipsa Trinitas, et sic unus Deus quomodo unus creator.[1]

This one God is Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. Subordinationism is thus rejected because all that is said of God is also said of each and every one of the Persons who are this God.[2] For Augustine all true thinking begins and ends with the Trinity. Thus it is only as Trinity that God creates us and only as Trinity that we can approach Him. The Three Persons have *ad extra* only one will and operation: "*Ubi nulla naturarum nulla est diversitas voluntatum.*"[3] In this very connection Augustine even altered the theory of theophanies which had been advanced by his predecessors. It is not the Word alone who appeared, but the Whole Trinity, God; and He did so, not by Himself, but by means of angels who spoke and acted in His name, who manifested themselves to man in a sensible form.[4] Each one of these three Persons is just as much as the other two Persons: "*Tantus est solus Pater, vel solus Spiritus sanctus quantus est simul Pater et Filius*

[1] Contra sermon. arian., 3.
[2] De Trinitate, V, 9.
[3] Contra Maximinum, II, 10, 2; De Trinitate, II, 9; Enchiridion, XXXVIII.
[4] De Trinitate, II, 12 ff.; III, 22–27.

et Spiritus sanctus." [5] This is circumincession: "*semper in invicem, neuter solus.*" [6] Again, the act, which in the Son's Incarnation, has united the Son to the human nature, thus sending Him into the world, is common to the whole Trinity.[7] Augustine tells us that all that refers to the nature and expresses something absolute must be worded in the singular, since the divine nature, the subject of that absolute, is one.[8]

Certainly the idea of Absolute Likeness by which things are made like, as they are made beautiful by Absolute Beauty, is taken over from Platonism. Once again, Plotinus' thought is very closely approached by Augustine's theology and all orthodox theology in the insistence on God's absolute self-sufficiency, on the completeness and self-containedness of His inner life of love and knowledge and its absolute primacy over the external activity of creation. For Christian theologians and even for Plotinus, an inwardly-turned love and contemplation is the essential divine activity and all God's actions on the creatures He calls into being are secondary. But for Christian theologians creation is not the automatic reflex action that follows the divine contemplation (as it is for Plotinus). Creation is an absolutely free and generous act of the Divine Will. God is not compelled by any necessity to create. The divine productivity is perfectly expressed by the Eternal Son. Creation and still more Redemption are extra and spontaneous flowings of the single great stream of will and love with which God wills and loves Himself. From all eternity God bore within Himself the archetypes and plan of creatures and of the world.[9] St. Augustine applies verses 3 and 4 of the first Chapter of St. John's Gospel, which he combined in this way: "*Quod factum est in ipso vita erat*"; all that was made was life in the Word, lived in Him, by the Idea He had of it.[10] Here again St. Augustine would depart from Plotinus in maintaining that we can only make such an approach to an understanding of God's inturned love and contemplation as is possible

[5] De Trinitate, VI, 9.
[6] De Trinitate, VI, 9, 8; XV, 8.
[7] De Trinitate, II, 8, 9.
[8] De Trinitate, V, 9, 11.
[9] De divers. quaest., LXXXIII, qu. XLVI, 2.
[10] De Genesi ad litt., V, 33.

to us when we realize that He is three Persons in One, and that His Unity is not the bare negation of multiplicity of Plotinus' thought at its most negative. Certainly the approach that Augustine had himself made to God in the religious experience of the vision of Ostia was of a much higher order and much more than the philosophical excursus toward the Plotinian "One." We have a remarkable study of the distinction between the approach to God of Augustine and the contemplation of Plotinus in the definitive study of the Plotinian scholar, Father Henry.[11]

Augustine was always convinced of the absolute dependence of man upon God and in this he realized how weak he himself was in seeing the truth or acting rightly when he had seen it by his own strength. Here he departed from Plotinus because Plotinus, like all the Greeks, held that the philosopher could and must act virtuously, purify his life, know the truth and ascend even to the threshold of the final vision or union by his own strength and without any special divine help. The Christian faith and in particular St. Paul taught Augustine to look elsewhere for the answer to his desperate condition. The absolute conviction of the transcendence of God and the insufficiency of all things created, their inability even to exist without God's sustaining presence, and above all of the utter helplessness of fallen man if left to himself is the deepest principle of Augustine's thought. We realize this principle is at work in his account of the creation, in his theory of knowledge, and in that doctrine of the good life, of the way of return of the redeemed soul to God, which is the center of his teaching and the terminus to which it is directed. This is so remarkably displayed in the De Civitate Dei, VII, 30, and in the De Genesi ad litt., IV, 23.

It is in the doctrine of relations in the Trinity that we have the peculiar contribution of Augustine to Trinitarian theology and the principal departures from Plotinus. Since Augustine has affirmed at the very beginning of his Trinitarian explanation that God is strictly one, the principal difficulty was to avoid modalism and account for the real plurality of Persons. We are introduced

[11] "Augustine and Plotinus," Journal of Theological Studies, XXXVIII (1937), 1–23. There is a much longer study of this most interesting question in Father Henry's longer work: La Vision D'Ostie, Paris, Vrin, 1938.

to the concept of relations and told that the Persons are relations and relations that are not identified with the substance or the nature since they are not something absolute. On the other hand these relations are not accidents because they are essential to the nature and like it eternal and necessary:

> Non secundum substantiam haec dicuntur quia non quisque eorum ad seipsum, sed ad invicem atque ad alterutrum ista dicuntur: neque secundum accidens, quia et quod dicitur Pater et quod dicitur Filius aeternum atque incommutabile est . . . Haec non secundum substantiam dicuntur, sed secundum relativum; quod tamen relativum non est accidens, quia non est mutabile.[12]

Thus the Father is called such *ad Filium*, the Son, *ad Patrem*, and the Holy Ghost, *ad Patrem et Filium*. As to the term person, it has been used in the Trinitarian language, for lack of a better term, to designate *three distinct objects*; but like all other terms, it must be understood of God analogically: "*Tres utique sunt . . . Tamen cum quaeritur quid tres, magna prorsus inopia humanum laborat eloquium. Dictum est tamen tres personae, non ut illud diceretur, sed ne taceretur.*" [13]

There is surely a very great departure from the emanation of Plotinus when we consider the generation of the Son. In the explanation of the generation of the Son he is following the regular Christian tradition. However, when considering the Holy Ghost it is well to advert that St. Augustine was the first to teach distinctly the procession of the Holy Ghost *a Filio* and to show why he held that doctrine: "*Non possumus dicere quod Spiritus sanctus et a Filio non procedat: neque enim frustra idem Spiritus et Patris et Filii Spiritus dicitur.*" [14] The production of the Holy Ghost is common to the Father and to the Son and in this respect it resembles the act of creation which is common to the three Persons; the Father and the Son are but one Principle of the Holy Ghost: "*Fatendum est Patrem et Filium principium esse Spiritus sancti, non duo principia.*" [15] It might be said that the

[12] De Trinitate, V, 6, 16, 17; VII, 24. Cf. De Civitate Dei, XI, 10, 1.
[13] De Trinitate, V, 10; VII, 8, 9.
[14] De Trinitate, IV, 29; Contra Maximinum, II, 14, 1; In Joannem tractatus, XCIX, 7.
[15] De Trinitate, V, 15.

Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father *principaliter*, because it is the Father who imparts to the Son, together with His substance, the power to produce the Holy Ghost.[16] St. Augustine admits that he cannot answer the question as to the intimate nature of this procession and in what it differs from the generation of the Son. Only in heaven shall we know the answer.[17]

The Divine Persons are, then, relations, and all that does not signify a relation in God is common to them. The Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost are *Wisdom*, although this word is used especially of the Son. Likewise, they are *Love*, although this title becomes more especially the Holy Ghost.[18]

In this entire psychological approach to the Trinity St. Augustine certainly advanced beyond the inheritance he received from others. He surpasses them all when he turns to the created world in search of analogies of the Trinity. It is true that Victorinus had given some indications of this but St. Augustine developed the subject and truly prepared the way for the later Scholastic speculations. Seven books of the De Trinitate (IX–XV) are devoted to the development of this theme. The author finds the image of the Blessed Trinity in the human soul which knows itself and loves itself: *mens*, *notitia*, *amor*. "*Haec tria unum atque una substantia*" (lib. IX, 18); in the memory, intelligence and will (lib. X); in the object that is seen, the vision and the attention of the one who sees (lib. XI); in the understanding of the teachings of the faith, the memory we keep of them and the effort we make to recall them (lib. XIII); finally, in the memory, knowledge, and love of God, for it is chiefly then that the soul, which is God's natural likeness because of its three faculties of memory, intelligence and will, becomes still more His likeness by the thought of God who lives in it (lib. XIV).

It is because Augustine realizes full well the inadequacy of all the psychological trinities, as images of the highest Trinity, that he does not attempt in Book XV a cut-and-dried exposition of the doctrine of the nature of the Triune God. His work is not a textbook in dogmatic theology but an exercise in the method

[16] De Trinitate, XV, 29; cf. 47, 48.
[17] De Trinitate, XV, 45; cf. IX, 17, 18.
[18] De Trinitate, VII, 1–4; XV, 27–37.

of intellectual contemplation which finds its climax in the celestial vision of the eternal, incorporeal, and immutable things of God. "*Jam ergo in ipsis rebus aeternis, incorporalibus et incommutabilibus, in quarum perfecta contemplatione nobis beata, quae nonnisi aeterna est, vita promittitur, Trinitatem quae Deus est inquiramus.*" [19] Therefore, Grabmann believes that the theology of the De Trinitate culminates in a mysticism which is characteristic not only of the personal thought of St. Augustine but of all medieval Catholic mysticism.

Augustine's concentration upon the inner spiritual reality of God and his direction away from the external, material world are manifest in his consideration of the forms in matter to be nothing but the likenesses of the Divine Ideas and traces of God (*vestigia*). We see the same in Plotinus who considered the forms to be "*indalmata*," the last and lowest appearances of spiritual reality. Certainly, when we study God in His relation to the created world we can understand how strongly influenced Augustine was in his description of the *rationes aeternae* by the Platonic theory of Ideas, and by Plotinus' doctrine that the first emanation contains the intelligible principles (*logoi*) of all things.[20] We know that Augustine accepted the Platonic theory of Ideas with the qualification that has become characteristic of Christian Platonism, viz., that these Ideas reside in the mind of God.

Augustine himself believed that no other Greek school of philosophy offered such possibilities for the approach to the God of Christianity. In the De Civitate Dei (VIII, 5; I, 330A), after a short but accurate summary of pre-Platonic philosophy in Greece, Augustine affirms again the judgment of his earlier works: Plato was the best of the ancient philosophers and most nearly approached the Christian concept of God. Contrasted with the materialism of the later Epicureans or Stoics, the Platonic approach to the human soul and to God is infinitely preferable. We might say that this very high esteem for the position of Plato which includes the Neo-Platonism of Plotinus is expressed in terms of his own metaphysics:

> Let all these thinkers give way, then, as we have said, to the

[19] De Trinitate, XV, 4, 6; col. 1061.
[20] Enneades, IV, 4, 16.

> Platonists. Even let those give way, who have been ashamed to say that God is a body but who have thought that our souls are of the same nature as God. The great mutability of the soul, which is wrongly attributed to the nature of God, has not deterred them in this. Rather, they say: the nature of the soul is changed by the body, though in itself the soul is unchangeable. This is like saying: flesh is wounded by some kind of body, though in it itself flesh cannot be wounded. The fact of the matter is, that an immutable thing cannot be changed by anything, and the fact that a thing can be changed by a body shows that it can be changed by something, and therefore cannot rightly be called immutable.[21]

It is interesting to advert to the defense that Augustine makes of Plotinus in the 10th book of the De Civitate Dei when he is considering the question of demonolatry as encouraged by the Neo-Platonic theologians. Augustine says that this would attribute *latria* to someone other than God and such an error is opposed not only to Christianity but is incompatible with the principles of Plotinus. Plotinus held that God is the intelligible light of the human soul, and that the intellectual creature has no superior save God.[22] Augustine in his praise of Plotinus even goes so far as to say that, on this point, Plotinus was in agreement with (*consonans evangelio*) the famous gospel of St. John, in which the true light of man is held to be the Christ-God. However, the followers of Plotinus perverted and distorted his philosophy. What greater respect could be shown?

The transmutation of Plotinus' theology by Augustine will always remain for philosophers the remarkable example of grace working in history. Deeper research only reveals all the more the consistent, constant presence of God in history.

[21] De Civitate Dei, VIII, 5; I, pp. 332–333H.
[23] De Civitate Dei, X, 2; I, 406 B–C.

MILTON'S ARIANISM *

J. H. ADAMSON

Department of English, University of Utah
Salt Lake City, Utah

Since Maurice Kelley's unequivocal statement in This Great Argument that "*Paradise Lost* is an Arian document," [1] scholars have generally consented to call Milton an Arian.[2] Professor William B. Hunter's recent article [3] has effectively shifted the burden of proof. I should like to provide some supporting evidence for Mr. Hunter's thesis, and one qualification.

It is a commonplace that one must, when examining any poet's thought, consider carefully the imagery in which that thought is embodied; for a poet, in contradistinction to a metaphysician, consistently employs symbol rather than abstraction as a vehicle for the expression of his meaning. In a consideration of Milton's views on the nature of the Trinity, the symbols are significant for an additional reason, for in the long Athanasian-Arian controversy, it was quite literally by his metaphors that a disputant most clearly revealed his position. The development of these characteristic metaphors requires some explanation.

The Christian identification of Jesus as Son of God with the divine Logos posed some extremely difficult problems for early Christian thinkers. Any logical formulation of the concept seemed inevitably to involve some sacrifice of belief that Christians were unwilling to make. Pagans found no difficulty in a subordinationist concept, but the passionate monotheism inherited by Christianity from Judaism was the basis, ultimately, of the reaction against subordinationism. If the Christ were an inferior deity

* Research for this article was carried out under a grant from the University of Utah Research Fund to which grateful acknowledgment is made.

[1] This Great Argument (Princeton University Press, 1941), p. 122. For a discussion of the various views, see especially n. 86, p. 118. Cf. Kenneth Muir, John Milton (New York, 1955), pp. 164–165.

[2] Although Mr. C. S. Lewis defends Milton as being more orthodox than has generally been thought, he nevertheless says, "Milton was an Arian." A Preface to Paradise Lost (5th printing, 1946), p. 84.

[3] "Milton's Arianism Reconsidered," Harvard Theological Review, LII (January, 1959), pp. 9–35.

he was not to be worshipped. From this dilemma arose two tentative solutions, both of which were ultimately rejected.

Sabellius, in his desire to maintain the absolute unity of God, postulated that the Father, Son and Paraclete were really three manifestations or modes of the one Divine Being. He did not hesitate to assert what the logic of his position obviously called for, that the Father suffered when Jesus died on the cross. From this particular tenet came the name Patripassianists by which disciples of Sabellius were frequently known in the West. They were also referred to as Sabellians and Modalists.

The other important formulation, that of Arius, also arose from the need to maintain the unity and absolute oneness of Deity. Arius, therefore, maintained that Christ was created like any other creature, that he was raised through merit to Godhood and worshipped at the Father's command. It was especially around these two formulations that controversy raged, and the ultimate solution came in the rejection of both of them in favor of the semantic paradoxes of the Athanasian creed.[4]

But from the very beginning nearly all of the Fathers accepted a common set of metaphors which expressed a particularly close relationship between the Father and the Son. There are three metaphors in particular which appear continuously in patristic writings from the time of Justin Martyr through Athanasius: sun and radiance (or torch and fire), a fountain and its stream, or an archetype and its image. Thus Origen says that the generation of the Son "is as eternal and everlasting as the brilliancy which is produced from the sun."[5] These images seem to be the most characteristic expression in the writings of Athanasius and he returns to them again and again in his opposition to the Arians. The Logos, he says, is the image of the Father, an image which from the beginning was mirrored in the Divine Mind; he is as fire from a torch, as light from radiance, as a stream from a fountain.[6]

[4] The Athanasian Creed was a relatively late solution, the main elements of which were Augustinian. See Adolph Harnack, History of Dogma, trans. Neil Buchanan, et al. (Boston, 1899–1901), IV, p. 134.

[5] The Writings of Origen, I, trans. Rev. Frederick Crombie, Ante-Nicene Christian Library, Vol. X (Edinburgh, 1869), pp. 22, 24.

[6] St. Athanasius, Select Works and Letters, ed. Archibald Robertson, Nicene

It is precisely here, in these metaphors, that the conceptual content of Athanasius' thought can be most clearly separated from that of Arius, for the latter specifically denied the validity of these metaphors and refused to accept them or their implications. Thus Harnack says,

> The images of the source and the brook, the sun and the light, the archetype and the type, which are almost of as old standing in the Church as the Logos-doctrine itself, are here discarded.

Arius, says Harnack, by his rejection of these metaphors indicates his rejection of the essential connection of the Logos with the Father, a connection which Athanasius and the other early Fathers had insisted upon. In short, Arius rejected an emanation theory altogether.[7]

But the old Athanasian metaphors, anathema to Arians, are Milton's constant and unchanging symbols for the Godhead. His finest statement occurs in the Invocation to Light in Book III of Paradise Lost which begins with the Logos metaphor.

> Hail holy Light, offspring of Heav'n first-born,
> Or of th' Eternal Coeternal beam. (Vs. 1–2.) [8]

It should be remembered that in the writings of the Alexandrian Fathers and in all those of the Neo-Platonists, light is the particular symbol of the Logos, the Divine Reason. Thus Henry More, Milton's coeval at Christ's College, Cambridge, says,

> The highest manifestation of that Light created in the First day, being the face of *Jesus Christ*, the *Heavenly Adam* . . . the *divine Intellect* as it is communicable to humane Souls.[9]

Milton, then, has embodied in his metaphor the idea common to the Neoplatonists, to Philo and to the Greek Fathers that the Logos or Divine Reason was with the Eternal in the beginning as radiance has always emanated from the sun, that Thought (or

---

and Post-Nicene Fathers, Second Series (Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1953), pp. 311, 314, 315, 321, 400–401, et passim. Cf. Harnack, IV, p. 31, n. 3.

[7] Harnack, History of Dogma, IV, pp. 39–42, esp. 41.

[8] All quotations from Paradise Lost are taken from Merritt Hughes' Odyssey Press edition.

[9] A Collection of Several Philosophical Writings of Henry More (4th edition, London, 1712), "Conjectura Cabbalistica," p. 209.

Logos) is related to the Mind of God even as splendor is related to a luminous body. The Son is the "Bright effluence of bright essence increate." (V. 6.)[10]

As the Invocation continues, Milton employs the second common Athanasian metaphor, that of fountain and stream.

> Or hear'st thou rather pure Ethereal stream,
> Whose Fountain who shall tell? before the Sun,
> Before the Heavens thou wert, and at the voice
> Of God, as with a Mantle didst invest
> The rising world of waters dark and deep. (Vs. 7–11.)

The Fountain of which no man can tell is, to change the metaphor, the Cloud of Unknowing, the Divine Darkness of the mystics. From that fountain streams the Divine Reason, the Mediator between that Unknowable and the creation.

As the scene unfolds, the third familiar metaphor from the early Fathers appears, that of archetype and image.

> . . . on his right
> The radiant image of his Glory sat,
> His only Son . . . . (Vs. 62–64.)

I think it is a safe generalization to say that Milton never conceives of the Godhead except under these traditional symbols. When the angels praise the Father and the Son, they sing of the "Fountain of Light" and then of the "Begotten Son, Divine Similitude,"

> In whose conspicuous count'nance, without cloud
> Made visible, th' Almighty Father shines . . . . (Vs. 372–86.)

Possibly the climactic use of Athanasian imagery occurs in Book VI when the Father commissions the Son to destroy the powers of darkness.

> He said, and on his Son with Rays direct
> Shone full, he all his Father full exprest
> Ineffably into his face receiv'd . . . . (Vs. 719–21.)

[10] In all theologies there is only one "uncreated essence," and that is the "hidden God," the Divine Ground. The bright effluence of the Divine Ground is the Logos under the image of Light. Thus Milton, in Samson Agonistes refers to light as the "prime work of God." (V. 170.)

It seems obvious enough that Milton continuously images the Trinity in terms of the Athanasian metaphors that Arius had explicitly rejected. Milton's thought is unquestionably emanationist. When we remember further that Arius had declared the Son to be created out of nothing and recall that Milton, on the other hand, maintained that "God imparted to the Son as much as he pleased of the divine nature, nay of the divine substance itself, care being taken not to confound the substance with the whole essence," [11] it is clear that Milton is no Arian and that the term Arianism cannot accurately be applied to his doctrine of the Godhead.

So much for the supporting evidence. I now turn to the one qualification of Mr. Hunter's thesis that seems to me appropriate. I believe that Mr. Hunter is obviously right in finding an ultimate source of Milton's views on the Trinity in the long tradition of Platonic and Neoplatonic theories and particularly in the "trinitarian" discussions of Philo Judaeus. But I think that he does not sufficiently recognize that it was the early Greek Fathers who were central to the thought of the Cambridge Platonists and other liberal thinkers of the seventeenth century, including Milton himself; that it was these Fathers who provided the nexus between Biblical Christianity and Alexandrian Neoplatonism. There is little point in looking for the minute theological differences which partisans may wish to find in the Neoplatonist and Christian-Platonist speculations on the nature of the Trinity. Of greater importance is the remarkable similarity of such theories. Nor is this similarity surprising. All of the Alexandrian Fathers accepted one of the principal contentions of Philo, namely that all Greek learning ultimately derived from Moses.[12] Such an attitude obviated the surly antagonism toward Greek philosophy manifested by some of the Latin Fathers and made it

[11] The Works of John Milton, ed. F. A. Patterson, et al. (New York, 1931–38), XIV, p. 193. For a summary of Arius' views, see Harnack, IV, pp. 15 ff. Arius said that the Son had only a relative knowledge of the Father. Cf. Milton's lines above.

[12] See Questions and Answers on Genesis, trans. Ralph Marcus, in Philo, Supplement I, Loeb Classical Library (Harvard University Press, 1953), III, 5 (p. 188); IV, 152 (p. 434). Cf. H. A. Wolfson, Philo (Harvard University Press, 1947), I, pp. 140–143.

somewhat irrelevant whether one quoted Proclus or Clement of Alexandria.

In the seventeenth century, the humanists of all nations were turning to the Greek Fathers for support in arguments over such questions as free will and universal salvation. Calvinists, on the other hand, rejected Greek theology far more violently than had the Church of Rome. Calvin said that "the Greeks beyond all others . . . have exceeded all bounds in extolling the ability of the human will. . . ." In fact, he said, all of the fathers except Augustine had been so aberrant in their treatment of the subject of grace and free will that nothing certain could be learned from their writings.[13] In contrast to Calvin's denunciation stands the statement of Henry More, the Cambridge Platonist, that Origen "was surely the greatest Light and Bulwark that ancient Christianity had. . . ." [14] Another humanist, Alexander Gill, Milton's onetime schoolmaster, said, "Ah, blessed Origen! hath thy too much charity been blamed so long?" [15] Lancelot Andrewes expressed a similar attitude: "His name is Jesus Christ, half Hebrew, half Greek . . . so sorted of purpose to show Jews and Greeks have equal interest in him." [16] Hugo Grotius, whom Milton as a young man "was very desirous of seeing," and whose drama Adamus Exul seems to resemble Paradise Lost more closely than do any other of the hexameral writings, said that the Augustinian articles in the Protestant confessions did not sufficiently consider the views of the Fathers of the first four centuries.[17]

The revival of Greek theology directly affected the trinitarian issue, for in the earliest ages all the Fathers were subordinationists. As Eugene De Faye has said, no one of that time could have been anything else because the entire Logos doctrine arose from the need of a Mediator, subordinate in some way to the Unknowable.[18]

[13] Institutes of the Christian Religion, trans. John Allen (London, 1813), II, ii, iv; II, ii, ix.

[14] Philosophical Writings, "The Immortality of the Soul," p. 116.

[15] Sacred Philosophie (London, 1635), Article I, p. 18.

[16] Ninety-Six Sermons, ed. J. P. W. (Oxford, 1841–43), I, p. 27.

[17] See A. W. Harrison, Arminianism (London, 1937), p. 65.

[18] Origen and His Work (London, 1926), pp. 102–103. The Catholic Encyclopedia, s. v. "Fathers" (Vol. VI, p. 12) says that "to our amazement" the early Greek apologists taught that the Son had a "distinct being" from the Father.

The crucial issues which led to an abandonment of subordinationist doctrine had not then arisen. Ralph Cudworth, Milton's contemporary who became master of Milton's own college, illustrated the influence of Greek theology when he said that "the generality of Christian doctors, for the first three hundred years after the apostles' time plainly asserted" a subordinationist doctrine. Such a doctrine he specifically denies to be Arian. He names, and rightly, Justin Martyr, Athenagoras, Titianus, Irenaeus, Tertullian, Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Gregory Thaumaturgus, Dionysius of Alexandria, Lactantius and many others as early Christians who held subordinationist views. He quotes from Lactantius, in illustration of his point, a passage that employs the Athanasian-Miltonic metaphors.

> Both the Father and Son is God; but he as it were an exuberant fountain, this as a stream derived from him: he like to the sun, this like a ray extended from the sun.[19]

Another interesting work which illustrates the relation of trinitarian controversy to the revival of Greek theology is Jean LeClerc's The Lives of the Primitive Fathers, written in 1696 and translated into English in 1701. The book contains, according to the subtitle,

> an Impartial account of their *LIVES AND WRITINGS*: With their several Opinions about the Deity of Christ. Which may give some Light to the late Disputes concerning the Trinity.

His own final opinion seems to be that of Cudworth and Milton, "that the *Orthodox* place not the Unity of God in the *Numerical Unity* of the Divine Essence, but in a *Specifick Unity* of Distinct and Equal Essences and in a perfect Agreement of Wills." [20]

The point could be demonstrated at some length, but perhaps one more significant example will suffice. The Calvinist Theophilus Gale charged Hugo Grotius with "rank *Socinianisme* and *Arianisme*," which, he said, were "foisted into the Primitive Churches by Origen. . . ." [21] Grotius' heresy, according to Gale,

[19] The True Intellectual System of the Universe, ed. Thomas Birch (New York, 1837), I, pp. 778–780, 765.

[20] (London, 1701), p. 255.

[21] Court of the Gentiles (Oxon., 1669–77), III, Preface, sig. $b2_v$.

was that he made Christ a "second cause" which is also, of course, what Milton and Cudworth did.

While the ultimate source of Milton's trinitarian thought may lie in Neoplatonic writers, I think that neither he nor his contemporaries thought of themselves as having derived their thought from such sources. They seem, rather, to have believed that they had rediscovered in the early Greek Fathers the original and therefore "true" doctrine of the Trinity. Neoplatonism was thought of as a support, not a source. If Greek learning derived from Moses, then the striking similarity of Greek and Christian thought was understandable; even if one did not specifically hold for such a derivation, however, the Logos doctrine could sufficiently account for "common notions."

In 1882 portraits of various worthies were placed in the twenty-one lights of the west oriel of Christ's College. In this series, William Perkins is the last Calvinist. He is followed, among others, by Milton, More and Cudworth.[22] The general movement of mind from Perkins to Cudworth was also a movement from a Latin to a Greek theology. And it is out of this movement that Milton's trinitarian thought arose.

[23] John Peile, Christ's College, University of Cambridge College Histories (London, 1900), p. 32.

A CONTEMPORARY REPORT ON THE CONDITION OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH IN RUSSIA, 1922 *

JAMES J. ZATKO
University of Notre Dame
Notre Dame, Indiana

The modern Catholic problem in Russia, like the Jewish problem, begins with the Polish Partitions; and its history ends with its violent solution in 1923 by the Bolsheviks, who completed the task at which the tsars had so long and persistently worked. The human material of this story consisted of 1,693,549 Roman Catholics and 3,033,968 Greek Catholics in 1804, if we excluded those who had not received the sacraments. By the same year the Latin Catholics had been organized into the vast Archdiocese of Mohylew and seven suffragan sees of Wilno, Samogitia, Luck-Zytomir, Kamieniec, and Minsk. Except for the establishment of Tiraspol-Saratov and the government suppression of Minsk and Kamieniec, this remained the hierarchical organization of the Latin Catholic Church in Russia. The Greek Catholic Church consisted of the Archdiocese of Polock and the dioceses of Luck and Brest, all of which disappeared in the union of Polock (1839) that forcibly annexed the Uniate Church to the Russian Orthodox.

The long century exposed the Catholics of Russia to a continuous pressure from the Orthodox Autocrat Tsars. The Ecclesiastical College, a governmental board that acted as the supreme governing body of the Catholic Church in Russia, kept the Catholics under the severe control of the government until the 1870's. The policy of Russification, implemented toward the Uniates in the Act of Polock and toward the Latins in the attempt to russify church services, weakened both religious and national consciousness. Nor were the Catholics always well served by their prelates, e.g., like the subservient Martin Laski, or by papal diplomats, e.g., Gregory XVI in Cum Primum.[1] And yet, somehow or other the Church managed to survive until the Bolshevik Revolution.

* The author discovered this document in Warsaw while he was on a Ford Foundation grant in Poland.

[1] For the papal attitude, see L. Lescoueur, L'Eglise Catholique en Pologne sous

After the liberal interlude of the Provisional Government, the Church had once again to face the traditional hostile Russian attitude, but there was a difference. After all, the Christian tsars had to reckon with a Christian framework of sorts and their attack on the Catholic Church took on the aspect of a crusade on behalf of the Orthodox Church. In the Bolshevik state the Catholic Church faced an antagonist whose hostility to religion was total. The Bolshevik regime consciously and deliberately set itself the goal of eradicating all religion.

On the political level the Bolshevik regime demonstrated its policy toward organized religion by nationalization of church property, the separation of Church and State, and finally in the decree on the confiscation of church valuables allegedly for famine relief. Besides the juridical aspects of the alienation of church property, this program created practical problems of a most serious kind: loss of funds for the maintenance of church life, government prescriptions for the use of churches (apparently in conflict with canon law), and the growing difficulty of conducting liturgical services.

Besides these official actions, there were the attacks on religion and churches, the organization of a League of the Militant Godless, a flood of anti-religious propaganda publications, and Komsomol Christmases to ridicule that feast.

In addition, the Catholic Church in Russia was looked upon by the government as an essentially Polish institution and as a representative of Polonism.

How all these measures affected the Catholics and how the Catholics reacted to them has been difficult to ascertain, simply because of the lack of first hand materials. The document that is here being edited and published is one extremely valuable source. It is a rough draft of a report on the condition of the Catholic Church in Russia in September, 1922. Its author was the Very Rev. Monsignor Constantine Budkiewicz, the pastor of St. Catherine's Church in Petrograd and dean of the Petrograd Catholic

---

le gouvernment Russe (1876), I, 211–215, who quite erroneously claims Gregory XVI (1830–1846), regretted his action; this is denied by A. Boudou, Le Saint Siege et la Russie (1922), I, 187–188. For a magisterial study of the origins of the Encyclical by the most distinguished Polish church historian, see M. Żywczynski, Geneza i nastepstwa Encyklik Cum Primum (1935).

clergy. He was executed by the Bolsheviks on March 31, 1923, after a sensational trial in which he and Archbishop John Cieplak, administrator of the Archdiocese of Mohylew since the arrest and exile of Edward Ropp, the archbishop of Mohylew, were the most prominent defendants.[2] Monsignor Budkiewicz wrote the report for Lorenzo Lauri, the titular archbishop of Ephesus and papal nuncio in Warsaw.[3] What enhances the value of this document is the fact that the final draft sent to the nuncio most probably perished in Warsaw during World War II.[4] So far as the present writer could discover, with the closing of the nunciature in Warsaw after the Polish defeat in 1939, the archives of the nuncio were transferred to the Primate's Palace in Warsaw for safekeeping. Presumably the archives perished when the Primate's Palace was destroyed.

The document was made available to the writer by the Very Rev. Monsignor Bronislaw Ussas, one of the few remaining priests of the archdiocese of Mohylew and now resident in Warsaw. He had been a member of the Commission for the Revindication of Polish Archives.

The significance of the document, furthermore, consists in this that it sheds light on the life of the St. Petersburg Catholics and their internal problems as well as on their relations with the Bolshevik government while they made an effort of some sort of coexistence with Bolshevik Communism.

Status Ecclesiae in Russia

I eunte regimine communistarum in Russia, pietas fidelium non solum non est diminuta, sed etiam aucta. Debiliores sane propter perturbationem rerum et idearum defecerunt, sed hi sunt paucissimi. Communiter autem homines sentientes se omnino in calamitatibus hodiernae vitae et persecutionem patientes nullum aliud refugium vident nisi solum Deum. Quam ob causam fideles nostri in Russia

[2] An eyewitness account of this trial is contained in F. McCullagh, The Bolshevik Persecution of Christianity (1924); occasionally it is marred by what were for a foreigner unavoidable mistakes.

[3] Annuario Pontificio (1923), p. 374, p. 673.

[4] Most probably the intermediary between Archbishop Lauri and Monsignor Budkiewicz was Bishop Adolf Szelazek, auxiliary of Polock, who had suggested Monsignor Budkiewicz to the nuncio as a reliable and informed source of information. See also Annuario Pontificio (1923), p. 255.

nunquam erant tam religioni addicti quam hoc nostro tempore. Cuius rei testimonium est frequens fidelium communio et defensio Ecclesiarum et sacerdotum, aliquando magno cum periculo vitae et libertatis suscepta. Unde certo dici potest nunquam fuisse tam arctam coniunctionem fidelium cum ecclesia quam nunc.

Res temporales Ecclesiae in Russia pessime se habent. Causae huius rei sunt duae. Altera causa est reemigratio fidelium in patriam. Propter calamitiosam conditionem vitae in Russia permulti fideles discesserunt regione multique volunt discedere. Exemplo est paroecia s. Catharinae Petropoli, quae habuit circa 30,000 fidelium, nunc autem habet 5,000. Idem apparet in aliis paroeciis. Sunt quidem paroeciae, quarum numerus parochianorum non excedit 50 fideles. Altera causa inopiae ecclesiarum est status rerum oeconomicarum in Russia ac sic dicta "nationalisatio" bonorum ecclesiasticorum. Decreto de "nationalisatione" ecclesiae privatae sunt paucis reditibus, quos antea habuerunt, oblationes vero fidelium non sunt sufficientes ad honestam sustentationem. Quam ob rem sacerdotes necessitatibus carentes, coguntur paroecias relinquere et in patriam una cum parochianis suis redire, et aliquando contingit, ut ne quidem censuris ecclesiasticis in loco suae residentiae retineri possint. Nunc 30 ecclesiae una cum curia archiepiscopali carent pecunia necessaria. Nisi huic rei consulatur ecclesiae a sacerdotibus relictae in usum prophanum a communistis destinentur, et tali pacto stationes ecclesiasticae, tanto cum studio erectae, peribunt, et missionarii, qui aliquando revenient, non habebunt locum residentiae. Ex dictis patet Ecclesiam in Russia in periculo esse ac auxilio alacri indigere.

Praeterea periculum imminet omnibus ecclesiis nostris ex parte decreti 23 Januarii 1918 anni de separatione ecclesiae a statu, vi cuius omnia bona ecclesiastica declarantur pertinere ad populum Russiae seu ad rempublicam. Qua de causa parochiani, ut ius utendi ecclesia habeant, debent pactum cum gubernio inire, quod omnino disciplinae ecclesiasticae adversatur.

Hactenus contingebat fidelibus, ut bono cum successu contra dictum pactum protestarentur. Nunc autem, cum regimen communistarum audacius factum sit, magna cum tenacitate subscriptio pacti a fidelibus expostulatur simulque minatur si fideles resistant, ecclesias clausurum iri. Delegatus archiepiscopi Cieplak impetravit Moscoviae indutias unius mensis, intra quem Archiepiscopus posset a Sede Apostolica responsum accipere. Dubitando decisionem Beatissimi Patris eumque omnino spernentes sic dicti commissarii regiminis de novo conantur dictas subscriptiones fidelibus extorquere et iam

unam ecclesiam in oppido Gatschina prope Petropolim clauserunt. Tali pacto, si nullum nobis auxilium obveniet, ecclesiae nostrae claudentur et exspoliationi exponentur.

Optimum ecclesiis in Russia auxilium posset praestare gubernium polonicum vi Rigensis tractatus. Sed gubernium illud propter causas politicas erga regimen Russiae tam debile se ostendit, ut catholici nostri omnem spem melioris sortis a Polonia provenientis amitterent. Non est dubitandum, quin delegatio reipublicae polonicae bonam voluntatem interveniendi habeat urgendo observationem Rigensis tractatus. At difficultas in eo posita est, quod gubernium Poloniae non magna auctoritate utatur apud gubernium Russiae. Quam ob causam art. VII Rigensis Tractatus hactenus a Russia non observatur, quamquam post suam notam diplomaticam de hac re legatio Poloniae aliquoties verbaliter tractabat. Quod quidem in praesenti apparet, quando gubernium Russiae maxima cum severitate nostras ecclesias opprimit, etiam claudit et reliquias sanctorum prophanat.

Error fanaticus communistarum optime apparuit in prophanatione reliquiarum b. Andreae Bobolae. Momentum rei in eo positum est, ut gubernium adversus decretum suum de separatione ecclesiae a statu, quod inter caetera habet articulum de tolerantia, ingerat se in doctrinam Ecclesiae nostrae appellando cultum reliquiarum superstitionem.

Censebamus gubernium Russiae gratum se praebiturum Sedi Apostolicae pro subsidio famelicis praestito, sed spes nos fefellit. Officiales Russiae tam ephemeridibus quam in colloquio supradictum auxilium parvi pendere student. Maxime vero haec ingrata relatio ad Sanctam Sedem apparuit in rebus sacris redimendis. Ut nobis nunc notum est, Curia Romana, post promulgationem decreti de sic dicta exemptione rerum preciosarum ope telegraphi gubernio Russiae proponebat se precium aequivalens pro rebus sacris solvere velle. At gubernium non solum nullum responsum dedit, sed etiam prophanationi dictas res sacras exponere curabat simulque sacerdotes hac in re etiam passive se habentes in custodiam includebat et iudicio tradebat. In hac etiam causa Archiepiscopus J. Cieplak multa perpessus est et adhuc patietur. Ex mandato Archiepiscopi decanus Budkiewicz de redimendis rebus sacris Moscoviae cum gubernio tractabat. Nimirum Archiepiscopus statim post acceptum ab Eminentissimo Cardinali Gasparri de hac re nuncium scripsit ad gubernium epistolam, ubi postulabat, ut, vi conventionis cum Sede Apostolica, res sacrae ultra non eximerentur, iam exemptae ecclesiis redderentur, et sacerdotes hac in causa in custodiam traditi liberarentur. Cum gubernium

nihil responderet, supradictus Budkiewicz in scripto proposuit conditiones emptionis rerum sacrarum, explicans quod tam Archiepiscopus quam sacerdotes hac in re accusati non debent tractari ut animo "contrarevolutionis" gubernio non obedientes, sed solummodo ut secundum ius canonicum agentes, atque vi decreti de tolerantia religiosa nulla poena afficiendos esse. Ad hoc propositum respondit officialis Crassicof gubernium severissimo modo reos iudicaturum et puniturum. Quod vero attinet res sacras auferendas, gubernium non posse suum decretum mutare, sed posse Sedi Apostolicae res iam ablatas vendere, ut vendit mercatoribus, precio maximo.

Responsum hoc mirum videtur, si perpendatur pacifica propositio Sedis Apostolicae emendi res sacras.

Alii delegato Cancelario Trojgo gubernium Russiae respondit se non posse res sacras vendere, quia ignorat, ubi sint.

Causa propter quam gubernium non abstinuit se a prophanatione rerum sacrarum videtur esse haec, quod sperabat se occasione "exemptionis" scissionem in Ecclesia facturum, ut factum est in confessione russica.

Gravissimi momenti est propagatio fidei Catholicae in Russia. Cum Exarcha unitarum Petropoli pro Russia nominatus esset, sine merito sperabatur permultos Russos ad Ecclesiam ritus orientalis conversuros esse. Sed spes illa feffelit. Exemplo esse potest Petropolis. Habitant hic in praesenti praeter exarcham quattuor sacerdotes ritus orientalis, quorum unus manet apud parochiam Sancti Stanislai. Exarch Fiodorof habet in urbe capellam suam, duo manent penes ecclesiam s. Catharinae, unus ad procathedralem ecclesiam. Omnes isti sacerdotes sunt viri pii bonumque exemplum vitae praebent. Nihilominus tamen numerus conversorum in ritum orientalem non excedit 90 personas. E contra ad ritum latinum conversi sunt circa 3,000. Eadem proportio apparet etiam in aliis locis.

Quamquam et sacerdotes ritus latini praedicant in lingua russica, hoc tamen (contra opinionen Exarchae Fiodorof) non impedit, quominus conversi eligant ritum slavonicum. Inter praedicationem Exarchae Fiodorof, et praedicationem aliorum sacerdotum, etiam ritus orientalis, Petropoli hoc est discrimen, quod hi explicant et errores schismatiscorum, pater vero Fiodorof putat hoc esse magnopere noxium propagationi unionis et tolerantiam suam eousque extendit, ut etiam schismaticis nondum conversis in sua capella sacramenta poenitentiae et s. Eucharistiae administret (ut dicit, ex verbali licentia Beatissimi papae Pii X). Iidem schismatici sacramenta suscipiunt tam in capella Exarchae quam in ecclesiis schismaticis. Praeterea

Fiodorof eo tendit ut Sedes Apostolica exclusive ipsi soli suisque subditis propagationem fidei catholicae in Russia committat omnesque conversos Russos necessario ritum orientalem complecti. Sacerdotes vero ritus latini ad haec respondent se nullam hucusque hac in re specialem dispositionem Sanctae Sedis accepisse ideoque debere dirigi Jure Canonico et theologia pastorali; quod autem ad ritum attinet — neminem posse vi adtrahi.

Idem Fiodorof opinionem propagat polonos sacerdotes non posse propagatores fidi inter Russos esse propter nationalismum polonorum et invidiam Russorum erga polonos. Unde, ut ait Exarcha Fiodorof, Russi, qui nunc non convertuntur, sed decursu temporis converti possunt, odio erga polonos praedicatores vel missionarios ducti (aucto propter conversionem aliquorum Russorum in ritum latinum) etiam in ritum slavonicum non convertuntur. Opinionem hanc esse erroneam patet ex eo, quod sacerdotes poloni non produnt nationalismi animum, sed e contra sciunt linguam russicam et hac lingua praedicant. Praeterea, parochi poloni videntes inopiam sacerdotum conversorum, hospitio in domus suas illos receperunt. Insuper in ecclesia s. Catharinae celebratur quavis Dominica specialis missa pro Russis in ritu latino et slavonico — cum praedicatione. Unde ratio propter quam quidam contumaces converti nolunt, omnino ridicula et irrationabilis videtur. Ob eandem rationem displicent Exarchae Fiodorof praelectiones et disputationes de rebus fidei, quae lingua russica quavis hebdomada magno cum concursu Russorum penes ecclesiam s. Catharinae Petropoli locum habent.

Tali pacto res, quae ad mentem Ecclesiae unitis viribus fieri debeat, dividitur in contrarias partes, quarum altera repraesentatur a fanaticis ritus orientalis, Fiodorof Petropoli et Abricosof Moscoviae, altera vero a sacerdotibus latinis et ceteris sacerdotibus ritus orientalis, qui exarchae sui fanaticum errorem non sequuntur.

Adhuc pauca verba de biritualismo, qui dicitur. Persuasione sacerdotum latinorum et nu nnullorum orientalium opus propagandae fidei catholicae in Russia maxime promoveretur, si sacerdotes latini et orientales haberent facultatem celebrandi in uno vel altero ritu pro rerum locorumque ratione, quod nostris praesertim temporibus, quando numerus sacerdotum catholicorum in Russia in dies minuitur, omnino necessarium videretur. Biritualismus ideo etiam optandus videtur, quod tunc non oriretur in Russia ista spiritui amoris christiani opposita divisio in duas ecclesias catholicas: latinam et orientalem, quae quidem divisio hic et nunc non existit, sed importuno agendi modo effici potest. Imo, biritualismus perpetuo moneret

fideles utriusque ritus unam esse ecclesiam catholicam, quae utrumque ritum eiusdem valoris esse docet et ideo pro rerum necessitate, in uno alterove ritu celebrare permittit. Ex idea biritualismi sua sponte unitas hierarchica sequitur.

Paucitas conversorum in ritum orientalem videtur sequenti ratione explicari posse. Russi, etsi iam natura sua sunt "Deum quaerentes" (russice bogazhatieli), hoc est, veram fidem cognoscere sapientes, maxima ignorantia in rebus fidei laborant. Quam ob causam horum fides fere omnino affectu et animi motibus innititur, non vero ratione, et hoc quidem notatur non solum apud indoctos, sed etiam apud nobiles et cultos homines. Quod quidem omnibus gentibus orientalibus proprium est, quorum animus superstitionem paganorum in religionem christianam transfert. Illo affectu ducti Russi, de veritate in Ecclesia catholica latente persuasi, maxima ex parte tantam aversionem erga schismaticam confessionem sentiunt, ut omnem reminiscentiam eius (ergo et ritum orientalem) vitare curent. At non solum ritus illis schismaticam confessionem in memoriam revocat, sed et ipsi sacerdotes uniti. Qui, etiamsi Catholici iam sint, manent tamen cultura orientali, vel potius defectu culturae, imbuti et habent eundem modum agendi, ac schismatici sacerdotes. Unde neo-conversi interrogati ad quem ritum adnumerari velint, respondent se velle omnino Ecclesiae Catholicae adscribi et eligunt ritum latinum. Quamquam enim eis res clare explicatur, maxima tamen ex parte habent quandam Ecclesiam ritus orientalis non omnino catholicam. Quae quidem opinio dominat non solum apud laicos sed etiam apud clerum schismaticum, cui non sunt ignota principia ecclesiasticae disciplinae.

Praeter enumeratas quaestiones, sunt quaedam quae spectant calendarium. Exarcha vi potestatis a metropolita, A. Szeptycki, obtentae, exigit ut sacerdotes ritus orientalis penes ecclesias latinas degentes in celebratione missae tam privatae quam solemnis calendarium veteris styli servent, quod nobis videtur contrarium regulis liturgicis simulque offendit liturgicum ordinem in ecclesiis latinis, et causat quoddam scandalum parochianorum, v.g., si die Paschatis secundum novum stylum celebretur missa quadragesimalis.

Pseudoreformatio confessionis schismaticae, quae nunc fit in Russia, initio videbatur profutura conversioni Russorum. Qui vere orthodoxum animum habent, in sua ecclesia veritatem erroribus contaminatam videntes, necessario ad catholicam fidem se conversuros. Sed hac in re aliter factum est. Imprimis clerus schismaticus, curae et tutelae gubernii assuetus, sine qua iam illi existere difficile est, curam novi gubernii non detractat. Communistae, a priori omnem religionem

negantes, post aliquod tempus intellexerunt se non posse religionem in populo eradicare, sed posse ecclesiam schismaticam in servitutuem sibi redigere. Sane, si clerus schismaticus spiritum ecclesiasticum haberet, hoc illis non contingeret. Sed clerici, praesertim aliqui superiores, protestantismo imbuti, iam ideam puram Ecclesiae amiserunt, et patriarcham suum vi amoverunt. Hoc quidem eo modo factum est, quod gubernium imperatorum timens, ne clerus Russiae aliquid commune cum Ecclesia Catholica habeat, curabat ut, ad veritatem obumbrandam principia protestantismi in scholis ecclesiasticis traderentur. Tali pacto decursu temporis factum est, ut ecclesia schismatica, quae in dogmatibus videbatur parum differre ab Ecclesia Catholica, nunc protestantismum sapiat. Unde facile intelligi potest illud, cur clerus Russiae, olim approbante gubernio, aliquoties cum ecclesia Anglicana et cum sic dictis veteribus Catholicis de fide convenire conatus est. Populus, ut supra dictum, est, quoad fidem omnino rudis et incultus, et gubernium timens, propter inertiam suam, sicut in allis rebus, ita et in causa religionis, post aliquod tempus pseudoreformatae ecclesiae suae assuescet. Paucissimi solummodo tam laici quam clerici resistere pseudoreformationi conantur, sed hi maxima ex parte in custodiam traduntur. Factum est sane quod sat multi clerici cum laicis, praeside archiepiscopo Antonino, qui initio animo pseudoreformationis novo gubernio obediebat, in comitiis Moscoviae protestabant contra pseudoreformationem et ingerentiam gubernii in res ecclesiae, sed hoc parum confessioni schismaticae prodesse videtur. Gubernium ad hoc respondit sese vi decreti de separatione ecclesiae a statu rebus ecclesiae non ingerere. Fautores autem pseudoreformationis contra Antoninum eiusque asseclas comitia fecerunt et excommunicationem pronuntiaverunt.

Has ob causas ecclesia Russiae, ab imperatoribus captivata et depravata, nunc gubernio Sovietistico subiecta manet. Quod quidem gubernium cautissime curat, ne "viva ecclesia" a quibusdam missionariis aliquid detrimenti capiat. Unde propagatio veritatis a missionariis extraneis omnino impossibilis vdetur.

Petropoli die Septembris 1922 a.

The Condition of the Church in Russia

Since Communist rule began in Russia, the piety of the faithful has not only not lessened, but rather has increased. The weaker

element has indeed defected because of the confusion of things and ideas, but it is very small. Generally men, perceiving themselves in the midst of calamities and suffering persecution, see no refuge but God alone. For this reason our faithful in Russia have never been more attached to religion than at this time. Evidence is the frequent reception of Holy Communion and the defence of the churches and clergy, sometimes undertaken with danger to life and liberty. Hence, we can certainly say that never has there been such a close bond between the Church and the faithful.

The temporal affairs of the Church are in very bad condition. There are two reasons for this. One reason is the reëmigration of the faithful to their fatherland.[5] Because of the calamitous conditions of life in Russia, very many of the faithful have departed from this region and many wish to leave. St. Catherine's parish in Petrograd is an example. It had 30,000 members; now it has 5,000. The same is true of other parishes. There are some parishes which do not have 50 parishioners. The other reason for the poverty of the churches is the economic condition of Russia and the so-called "nationalization" of church property.[6] By the decree of "nationalization" the churches were deprived of the small income which they formerly had; and the offerings of the faithful are not sufficient for a decent existence. Therefore, priests, lacking necessities, are forced to abandon their parishes and to return with their parishioners to their homeland; and sometimes they cannot be kept in their place of residence even by ecclesiastical censures. Now about 30 churches together with the archiepiscopal curia, lack the necessary funds. Unless this situation is remedied, the churches abandoned by priests will be converted to profane uses by the communists, and in this way churches, built with such zeal, will perish; and the missionaries who will some day return, will have no place of residence. From what I have said it is clear that the Church in Russia is in danger and needs speedy assistance.

Moreover, danger threatens all our churches from the decree

[5] The archdiocesan authorities had noted the plight of war refugees before this. See the extremely rare Kronika archidyecezyi Mohylowskiej i dyecezyi Minskiej, April, 1918, No. 4, pp. 68–70, for Archbishop Ropp's address to the Polish Catholic refugees about returning to Poland.

[6] The decrees on nationalization were published in Politika sovetskoi Vlasti po natsionalnom voprosu za tri goda 1917–IX–1920 (1920), p. 24., p. 110.

of January 23, 1918, on the separation of church and state.[7] By virtue of this decree, all church property is declared the property of the Russian people or of the republic. Therefore, the parishioners, in order to have the right to use the church must enter into an agreement with the government. This is altogether contrary to ecclesiastical discipline.

So far the faithful have been able to protest successfully against the above-mentioned pact. Now, however, since the communist regime has grown bolder, it is demanding very persistently from the faithful the signature of the agreement; at the same time it threatens to close the churches, if the faithful resist.[8] Archbishop Cieplak's delegate in Moscow requested a delay of one month, within which the archbishop could obtain a reply from the Apostolic See in this matter. Refusing to await the decision of the Holy Father and altogether spurning him, the so-called commissars of the government are trying anew to force signatures from the faithful and have already closed one church in the village of Gatschina near Petrograd.[9]

If we do not receive help, in this way our churches will be closed and exposed to plunder.

By virtue of the Treaty of Riga,[10] the Polish government would have been able to give the best assistance to the churches in Russia. But that government, because of political factors, shows itself so weak in the face of the Russian government, that our Catholics have lost all hope of an improved situation owing to action by the Polish government. Undoubtedly, the Polish delegation has the good will to intervene by urging the observance of the Treaty of

[7] For the decree, see P. V. Gidulianov, (ed.), Otdelenie tserkvi ot gosudarstva, 3rd. ed. (1926), pp. 368–369. Pravda, January 21, 1918; Osservatore Romano, June 3, 1921. An English translation is available in J. S. Curtiss, The Russian Church and the Soviet State, 1917–1950 (1953), pp. 332–333 a work that occasionally betrays a naïvete about Bolshevik intentions.

[8] The Instruction demanding again the signatures of committees was published in Izvestiia, August 12, 1922.

[9] M. Milich, "Protsess rimsko-Katolicheskogo dukhovenstva," Revolutsiia i tserkov (1923), Nos. 1–3, pp. 110–111 describes the closing of churches which Monsignor Budkiewicz feared.

[10] For the preliminary peace and the Treaty of Riga, see L. Shapiro, (ed.), Soviet Treaty Series (1940), I, 67–69, 105–116. For details of the negotiations by participants, see S. Grabski, The Polish-Soviet Frontier (n.d.), and J. Dąbski, Pokoj Ryski (1931). Typical of the more frivolous treatment is J. Shotwell and M. Laserson, Poland and Russia, 1919–1945 (1945).

Riga; the difficulty, however, lies in the fact that the Polish government does not enjoy great authority with the Russian government. Therefore, Article VII of the Treaty of Riga is not being observed by Russia so far,[11] although the Polish legation has dealt with the matter verbally several times after its diplomatic note. This is clear at present, when the Russian government is persecuting our churches with the greatest severity, even closing them and desecrating the relics of the saints.

The communists' fanatical error appears best in the desecration of the relics of Blessed Andrew Bobola.[12] It is significant that the government, against its own decree on the separation of the church and state (which also contains an article on religious toleration) intervenes in Catholic teaching by calling our veneration of relics a superstition.

We had thought that the Russian government would be grateful for the Apostolic See's assistance in the famine, but this hope has deceived us.[13] Russian officials endeavor to discount that aid both in their newspapers and in their conversations.[14] This ungrateful attitude toward the Holy See appeared most strongly in the matter of the purchase of the sacred vessels. As we know now, the Roman curia, after the decree on the so-called expropriation of valuables,[15]

[11] Article VII guaranteed the religious liberty and rights of the Polish population in Russia. Demands by Catholics in Russia for protection by virtue of this article led the Bolshevik authorities in Moscow to construe the article in the following way: 1) that even after the Treaty of Riga, Catholics in Russia remain subject to the laws of the country; 2) that the Catholic churches are at the disposal of Catholics on the same terms as other churches are for their members; 3) that the Treaty does not have the effect of an Edict of Restitution, nor does the Catholic Church acquire the status of a juridical person; 4) that Article VII deals with goods that originated in Poland. See Revolutsiia i tserkov (1922), Nos. 1–3, pp. 36–37.

[12] For reports on the exposure of relics, see Pravda, April 4, 1919, April 23, 1919. As to the relics of the Jesuit martyr, St. Andrew Bobola, see A. Kwiatkowski, Profanac ja zwlok Bl. Andrzeja Boboli Bezczeszczenie Swietosci Katolickich w Swietle dokomentow (1927).

[13] As early as August 5, 1921, Benedict XV (1914–1922) had written to the then papal secretary of state, Cardinal Peter Gasparri, and requested him to approach the heads of state about immediate effective aid of famine stricken Russia, Acta Apostolicae Sedis (1921), XIII, 428–429: Osservatore Romano, August 8–9, 1921. Ultimately, the papacy spent about $1,500,000 in its relief work in Russia.

[14] However, Russian officials did lavish fulsome praise on the papal relief mission at least in their contacts with the Vatican. See Osservatore Romano, January 18, 1923, March 18, 1923.

[15] For the decree on the confiscation of church valuables, see Izvestiia, February 24, 1922, February 26, 1922. For preliminary reports on church valuables, see Pravda, February 11, 1922; Izvestiia, February 12, 1922.

by telegraph offered the Russian government to pay an equivalent price for the sacred objects.[16] But the government not only did not give an answer, but also designedly exposed the sacred objects to profanation, and at the same time imprisoned and put on trial even priests who maintained a passive attitude in this matter. In this affair, too, Archbishop J. Cieplak[17] has already suffered and will suffer more. By order of the archbishop Dean Budkiewicz negotiated with the government at Moscow with a view to redeeming the sacred objects. Immediately after receiving the information from His Eminence Cardinal Gasparri, the Archbishop had written the government a letter in which he demanded that in virtue of the agreement with the Apostolic See, sacred objects should no longer be seized, those already expropriated be returned to the churches, and the priests arrested over this matter be freed. When the government gave no reply, the aforementioned Budkiewicz in a letter proposed conditions for the purchase of the sacred objects; he explained that the archbishop as well as the priests charged in this matter ought not to be treated as disobeying the government from a spirit of "counterrevolution," but only as acting according to Canon Law. Hence, by virtue of the decree on religious toleration, they are not to be punished in any way. To this proposal Krassikov,[18] an official in the commissariat of justice, replied that the government would judge and punish the guilty parties most severely; with regard to the removal of the sacred objects, the government could not change its decree, but it could sell objects already seized to the Apostolic See at the highest price, just as it was selling them to merchants.

This reply certainly seems marvellous, if one considers the peaceable offer of the Holy See to purchase the sacred objects.

[16] The negotiations between Cardinal Gasparri and Vladimir Vorovskii in Rome are described in F. Rutkowski, Arcybiskup Jan Cieplak (1857–1926): Szkic biograficzny (1934), pp. 267–270.

[17] Archbishop Jan Cieplak, titular archbishop of Ochrid and administrator of the archdiocese of Mohylew. He was tried in March, 1923 and condemned to be executed; but the sentence was commuted to ten years of solitary confinement. However, he was exiled in the next year. While on a tour of the United States, he died in 1926, without taking possession of the see to which he had been appointed, Wilno; see Acta Apostolicae Sedis, XVII, 647.

[18] Peter Krassikov was the head of the section on Religious Affairs in the Commissariat of Justice.

To the other delegate, Chancellor Troigo,[19] the Russian government replied that it cannot sell the sacred objects, because it does not know where they are.

The reason why the government did not restrain itself from the desecration of sacred objects seems to be that it hoped to produce a schism in our church by the "expropriation," as it did in the Russian confession.

The propagation of the Catholic faith in Russia is of the greatest importance. When a Uniate exarch at St. Petersburg was named for Russia, it was hoped, but without reason, that very many Russians would be converted to the church of the Eastern Rite.[20] This hope has proved false. Petrograd can serve as an example. Besides the exarch, four priests of the eastern rite live here, one of whom stays at the parish of St. Stanislaus. The Exarch Fiodorof [21] has his chapel in the city; two are at St. Catherine's church and one at the procathedral. All these priests are pious men, and they give good example by their lives. Nevertheless, the number of converts to the eastern rite does not exceed 90 persons. There are, on the contrary, about 3,000 converts to the Latin rite. That same proportion appears in other places.

Although the priests of the Latin rite preach in Russian, this does not (contrary to the opinion of Exarch Fiodorof) prevent the converts from choosing the Slavonic rite. Between the preaching of the Exarch Fiodorof and the preaching of the other priests (also of the eastern rite) at Petrograd there is this difference, that the latter explain the errors of the schismatics; Father Fiodorof,

[19] Reverend John Troigo, chancellor of the archdiocese of Mohylew.

[20] For a survey of the origins of this eastern rite Russian Catholic Church, see the very sketchy A. M. Ammann, Abriss der ostslawischen Kirchengeschichte (1950), pp. 579–580; also D. Kolpinskij, "Początki katolicyzmu wschodniego obrządku w Rosji," Kosciol Katolicki w Rosji: Materialy do jego historji i organizacji (1932), pp. 24–34; F. Karewicz, "Z Dziejow pracy unijnej n Rosji," Kosciol Katolicki w Rosji, pp. 43–57; Jan Urban, Katolicyzm i Prawoslawie (1912), pp. 38–57 gives an excellent analysis of the ideas of Vladimir Solovev and Bishop J. Strossmayer of Diakovo, which still play such an important rôle in Catholic activity among eastern rite Slavic peoples.

[21] Exarch Leonid Fedorov, ordained as a Catholic in 1911, returned to Russia, but was exiled to Siberia. After his return, he was named Exarch for the some 3,000 eastern rite Russian Catholics by metropolitan Andrew Szeptycki, Uniate Archbishop of Lwow (d. 1944), in 1917. Exarch Fedorov died a prisoner in Viatka, on March 7, 1935. See P. Mailleux, "The Catholic Church in Russia and Exarch Fedorov," Religion in Russia: A Collection of Essays Read at the Cambridge Summer School of Russian Studies (1940), pp. 31–48.

however, considers this very injurious to the spread of the Union, and pushes his tolerance so far as to administer the sacraments in his chapel to schismatics who have not as yet been converted. He asserts that he does this by reason of a verbal permission from Pope Pius X. These schismatics receive the sacraments in the Exarch's chapel as well as in their own schismatic churches. Furthermore, Fiodorof declares that the Apostolic See has committed the propagation of the faith in Russia exclusively to him and his subjects, and that all Russian converts must necessarily embrace the eastern rite. To this the Latin rite priests answer that on this problem they have so far not received any special instruction from the Holy See and that therefore they must be directed by Canon Law and pastoral theology. With regard to rite, they say that no one can be forced to adopt any rite.

Fiodorof is also spreading the opinion that Polish priests cannot be propagators of the faith in Russia because of the nationalism of the Poles and the hatred the Russians feel for the Poles. Therefore, says Exarch Fiodorof, Russians who are not being converted now but could be converted in the course of time, are not being converted even to the Slavonic rite because of a hatred for the Polish preachers (a hatred increased by the conversion of some Russians to the Latin rite). That this opinion is wrong is obvious, for the Polish priests do not act in the spirit of nationalism, but on the contrary they know the Russian language and preach in this language. Moreover, the Polish pastors, seeing the poverty of the convert priests, receive them as guests in their homes. Besides, every Sunday a mass in the Slavonic rite and the Latin rite is celebrated for the Russians in St. Catherine's Church — together with a sermon. Hence, the reason why certain obstinate persons do not wish to be converted seems altogether ridiculous and irrational. For the same reason Exarch Fiodorof is displeased with the lectures and debates on matters of faith which are held every week in Russian at St. Catherine's Church in Petrograd with a large Russian attendance.

In this way a matter which ought to be done with united forces leads to division into two opposite factions. One is represented by the fanatics of the eastern rite, Fiodorof at Petrograd and

Abricosof at Moscow;[22] the other is represented by the Latin rite priests, and the rest of the eastern rite clergy, who do not follow their exarch's fanatical error.

Still a few words about so-called biritualism. It is the conviction of the Latin priests and some of the oriental clergy, that the work of spreading the Catholic faith in Russia would profit greatly, if Latin and oriental priests had permission to celebrate in one or the other rite, depending on the time and place; especially in our times, when the number of Catholic priests is daily decreasing, this seems to be altogether necessary. Biritualism also seems advisable for the reason that then there would not rise in Russia that division into two Catholic churches, Latin and oriental, a division contrary to the spirit of Christian charity, and one which does not here and now exist, but could be created by an importunate manner of acting. Furthermore, biritualism would always teach the faithful that there is one Catholic Church which teaches that both rites have the same value. It permits celebration in one or the other rite according to necessity. From the idea of biritualism follows naturally hierarchical unity.

The fewness of converts to the eastern rite seems explicable from the following reason. Russians, even though they are by their nature already "God-seekers," that is, knowing how to recognize the true faith, are afflicted with a great ignorance in matters of faith. Therefore, the faith of these people rests almost wholly on sentiment and emotional states, and not on reason; and this is true not only of the unlettered but also of noble and educated men. This, indeed, is characteristic of oriental peoples, whose spirit has transferred pagan superstition into the Christian religion. Led by this sentiment, the Russians convinced that truth lies hidden in the Catholic Church, for the most part feel such an aversion for the schismatic confession, that they wish to avoid its every memory (hence, also the eastern rite). But not only does the rite recall to

[22] Vladimir Abrikosov with his wife Anna had joined the eastern rite Catholic Church; he was soon after ordained a priest, and his wife established the first Russian Dominican Community of nuns, whose foundress and superior she was. Abrikosov was expelled from Russia in September, 1922. Anna Abrikosova and her eighteen nuns were arrested. See the Archive of Archbishop Cieplak, Memorandum for the Commission for Russian Affairs at the Congregation for the Oriental Church, December 6, 1925, by Vladimir Abrikosov. The text was made available to the author by Professor Boleslaw Szczesniak.

them the schismatic confession, but so do the Uniate priests themselves. Even though these priests are Catholic, they remain imbued with an oriental culture (or rather a lack of culture), and behave in the same way that the schismatic priests do. Hence, when new converts are asked what rite they wish to belong to, they reply emphatically that they wish to join the Catholic Church and they choose the Latin rite. Although the matter is explained to them clearly, mostly they consider an eastern rite church as not entirely Catholic. This opinion is dominant not only among laymen, but also among the schismatic clergy, who are not unacquainted with the principles of ecclesiastical discipline.

Besides these questions already listed, there are some pertaining to the calendar. The Exarch, by virtue of power received from the metropolitan Andrew Szeptycki,[23] demands that priests of eastern rite attached to Latin churches, follow the Old Style calendar in the celebration of private as well as solemn Mass, which seems to us contrary to liturgical regulations, disturbs the liturgical order in the Latin churches, and somewhat causes scandal among the parishioners, for example, on Easter Day (according to the New Style), they celebrate a Lenten Mass.

The pseudoreformation of the schismatic confession now going on in Russia,[24] seemed first as though it might aid conversion of

[23] Andrew Szeptycki, Greek Catholic metropolitan archbishop of Halicz-Lwow (1901–1944) had a great faith in the eastern rite church as a means to effecting a union of churches. See his views, expressed in a lecture in Rome, Osservatore Romano, February 19–20, 1923. However, his plans for a union between the Catholic Church and the Ukrainian Orthodox Church were a dismal failure. For a Bolshevik account see E. Edlinskii, "Uniia s Rimon i mitropolit graf Sheptitskii," Revolutsiia i Tserkov (1924), Nos. 1–3, p. 109. See also Osservatore Romano, August 25, 1922. For secondary accounts of events in the Ukrainian Orthodox Church during the revolution, see S. K., "Ukrainska Prawoslawna Cerkiew," Sprawy Narodowosciowie (1927), I, 63–64; G. Luzhnitskii, Ukrainska Tserkva mizh skhodom i zakhodom (1954), pp. 545–547, written from a Ukrainian viewpoint; Ammann. op. cit., pp. 623–624.

[24] The details of the conflict of the patriarchal Russian Orthodox Church with the Living Church in Russia are amply given by Curtiss, op. cit., pp. 129–153, but this author labors under the illusion that the revolutionary is always progressive, liberal, and democratic. The Living Church, according to the evidence, was the willing tool of an undemocratic regime and used undemocratic means against its harassed opponent, the patriarchal church. For details about the Living Church, see Izvestiia, May 17, 1922; Pravda, May 25, 1922, for an article by E. Iaroslavskii about the rôle of the Living Church in the road to Socialism; Osservatore Romano, April 12, 1922, November 26, 1922, February 17, 1923 for a full report on the Living Church. See also National Archives, Documents, Russian Section, File No. 861. 404/48, May 31, 1922.

the Russians. But those who have a truly orthodox spirit, seeing in their church the truth fouled by errors, necessarily will be converted to the Catholic faith. The schismatic clergy, accustomed to the core and protection of the government, does not reject the support of the new government. The Communists, *a priori* denying all religion, after a while realized that they cannot eradicate religion in the population, but that they can reduce the schismatic church to slavery. Indeed, if the schismatic clergy had the ecclesiastical spirit, this would not have happened to them. But the clergy, especially some of the higher clergy, imbued with Protestantism,[25] have already lost the pure concept of the Church, and have forcibly removed their patriarch.[26] This was effected in the following manner. The Imperial government, fearing lest the Russian clergy have anything in common with the Catholic Church, in order to confuse the truth, undertook to see that the principles of Protestantism were taught in the ecclesiastical schools. Thus in the course of time the schismatic church, which seemed to differ but little from the Catholic Church in dogma, took on a Protestant coloring. Hence, it is easily understood, why the Russian clergy, with the approval of the government, tried several times to come to an agreement on matters of faith with the Anglican Church[27] and with the so-called Old Catholics.[28] The people, as I have said above, are altogether illiterate, uneducated, and fearful of the government, because of its inertia in religion as in other matters will after some time grow accustomed to their pseudoreformed church. Only very few clergy and laity tried to resist the pseudo-

[25] T. Prokopovich, Christiana Orthodoxa Theologia (1792), is one of theologians who followed Protestant tendencies in Theology. His Dukhovnii Reglament served as the basis for the Russian Orthodox State Church. See for other documents relating to this report, James J. Zatko, "The letters of Archbishop Lauri, Apostolic Nuncio in Warsaw, to Monsignor Budkiewicz of St. Catherine's, St. Petersburg, 1922–1923," The Polish Review 4 (1959), pp. 127–131.

[26] For the deposition of the Patriarch Tikhon by the Living Church, see Osservatore Romano, May 7–8, 1923.

[27] The Russian Orthodox relations with the Anglicans are discussed in A. Ratel, "La Question de l'union et du calendrier dans l'église Orthodoxe," Echos d'Orient 7 (1904), 91–99; with the American Episcopalian Church, A. Ratel, "La Question de l'union en Russie et en Amérique," Echos d'Orient 8 (1905), pp. 138–148; see Ammann, op. cit., pp. 282–284, 547–548.

[28] The Conferences at Bonn between Russian Orthodox and Old Catholics (1874–1875) did not achieve any union of the two groups. See Ammann, op. cit., pp. 547–548.

reformation, but most of these have been cast into prison. In fact, a considerable number of priests and lay folk, under the leadership of Archbishop Antonin,[29] who at first in the spirit of the pseudoreform obeyed the new government, met in Moscow and protested against the pseudoreform and against government interference in ecclesiastical matters. However, this seems to benefit the schismatic church but little. The government replied to this that by virtue of the decree on separation of Church and State it does not interfere with ecclesiastical matters. The advocates of the pseudoreform convoked a synod against Antonin and his followers and pronounced a sentence of excommunication.

For these reasons the Russian Church, held captive and corrupted by the emperors, is now subject to the soviet government. This government takes the greatest care lest the "Living Church" suffer any harm from certain missionaries. Hence, the propagation of the truth by foreign missioners seems completely impossible.

St. Petersburg September, 1922.

[29] Archbishop Antonin had joined the Living Church, then organized his own group of "The Church of the Rebirth," and finally became reconciled to the patriarchal church that had remained loyal to Patriarch Tikhon.

BOOKS RECEIVED

THE BAPTISMAL SACRIFICE. [*By*] *George Every.* London, SCM Press [1959] 112p. 22cm. (Studies in Ministry and Worship, 14.)

BILLY GRAHAM: Revivalist in a Secular Age. *By William G. McLoughlin, Jr.* New York, Ronald Press Company [1960] xi, 269p. 21cm.

FROM SLAVERY TO FREEDOM. *By Solomon Goldman.* [London and New York] Abelard-Schuman. Published in behalf of Solomon Goldman Memorial Foundation [1958] xiii, 751p. (The Book of Human Destiny, 3.)

THE MISSIONARY CHURCH IN EAST AND WEST. [*By*] *Charles C. West* [*and others*] *Edited by Charles C. West & David M. Paton.* London, SCM Press [1959; Stamped; Distributed by Allenson, Naperville, Ill.] 133p. 22cm. (Studies in Ministry and Worship, 13.)

NATURE AND HISTORY: A Study in Theological Methodology with Special Attention to the Method of Motif Research. [*By*] *Bernhard Erling.* Lund, CWK Gleerup, 1960. 286p. (Studia Theologica Lundensia, 19.)

RELIGION IN THE DEVELOPING PERSONALITY: Proceedings of the Second Academy Symposium 1958. *Academy of Religion and Mental Health with the Aid of The Josiah Macy, Jr. Foundation.* New York, University Press, 1960. xiii, 110p.

SCIENTIFIC BASIS FOR WORLD CIVILIZATION: Unitary Field Theory; The Origins, Evolution, Current Operation and Future Destiny of the Universe, Life, Mind, and the Social Group. *By Leo J. Baranski.* . . . Boston, U.S.A., The Christopher Publishing House [1960] 653p.

A SHORT HISTORY OF CHINESE PHILOSOPHY. *By Fung Yu-lan. Edited by Derk Bodde.* New York, The Macmillan Company, 1960. xx, 368p. 21cm. (Macmillan Paperbacks.)